arXiv:1608.05797v1 [math.RA] 20 Aug 2016

ZASSENHAUS CONJECTURE ON TORSION UNITS HOLDS FOR PSL$(2,p)$ WITH p A FERMAT OR MERSENNE PRIME

LEO MARGOLIS, ÁNGEL DEL RÍO, AND MARIANO SERRANO

Abstract. H.J. Zassenhaus conjectured that any unit of finite order in the integral group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$ of a finite group G is conjugate in the rational group algebra $\mathbb{Q}G$ to an element of the form $\pm g$ with $g \in G$. Though known for some series of solvable groups, the conjecture has been proved only for thirteen non-abelian simple groups. We prove the Zassenhaus Conjecture for the groups PSL$(2,p)$, where p is a Fermat or Mersenne prime. This increases the list of non-abelian simple groups for which the conjecture is known by probably infinitely many, but at least by 48, groups. Our result is an easy consequence of known results and our main theorem which states that the Zassenhaus Conjecture holds for a unit in $\mathbb{Z}$PSL$(2,q)$ of order coprime with $2q$, for some prime power q.

1. Introduction

One of the most famous open problems regarding the unit group of an integral group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$ of a finite group G is the Zassenhaus Conjecture which was stated by H.J. Zassenhaus [Zas74]:

> **Zassenhaus Conjecture:** If G is a finite group and u is a unit of finite order and augmentation 1 in the integral group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$, then there exists a unit x in the rational group algebra $\mathbb{Q}G$ and an element $g \in G$ such that $x^{-1}ux = \pm g$.

If for a given u such x and g exist, one says that u and $\pm g$ are rationally conjugate. The Zassenhaus Conjecture found much attention and was proved for many series of solvable groups, e.g. for nilpotent groups [Wei91], groups possessing a normal Sylow subgroup with abelian complement [Her06] or cyclic-by-abelian groups [CMdR13]. Regarding non-solvable groups however the conjecture is only known for very few groups. Although rational conjugacy of the torsion units of the integral groups rings of non-abelian simple groups have been studied by some authors, see e.g. [LP89, Ble99, Her07, Her08, BKL08, Sal13, BM14, BC15], the conjecture is still only known for exactly thirteen non-abelian simple groups (see [BM16, Proof of Theorem C] for an overview), all being isomorphic to some PSL$(2,q)$ for some particular small prime power q. Our aim in this paper is to extend this knowledge by proving the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let p be a Fermat or Mersenne prime. Then the Zassenhaus Conjecture holds for* PSL$(2,p)$.

This result increases the number of simple groups for which the Zassenhaus Conjecture is known from thirteen to sixty-one: The groups PSL$(2,q)$ with $q \in \{8,9,11,13,16,19,23,25,32\}$ or one of five known Fermat primes different from 3 or one of the forty-nine known Mersenne primes different from 3 [Calb]. Actually, Theorem 1.1 proves the conjecture for probably infinitely many simple groups because, based on heuristic evidences, it has been conjectured that there are infinitely many Mersenne primes [Cala]. Lenstra, Pomerance and Wagstaff have proposed independently a conjecture on the growth of the number of Mersenne primes smaller than a given integer [Pom81, Wag83]

Date: August 23, 2016.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16U60, 16S34.
The first author is supported by a Marie Curie grant from EU project 705112-ZC. The second author is partially supported by Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad project MTM2012-35240 and Fondos FEDER. The second and third authors are partially support by Fundación Séneca of Murcia 19880/GERM/15.

Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of known facts about the units of $\mathbb{Z}\,\mathrm{PSL}(2,q)$, collected in Theorem 2.2, with the following result to whose proof the biggest part of this paper is devoted.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $G = PSL(2,q)$ for some prime power q. Then any torsion unit of $\mathbb{Z}G$ of order coprime with $2q$ is rationally conjugate to an element of G.*

We prove this result employing a well known method which uses characters of a group G to obtain restrictions on the possible torsion units in $\mathbb{Z}G$. The idea of the method was introduced by Luthar and Passi [LP89] and extended by Hertweck [Her07]. Today this method is often called the HeLP (**He**rtweck**L**uthar**P**assi) Method. It has been shown in [dRS16] that a result as in Theorem 1.2 can not be achieved using solemnly this method if the unit has order $2p$, where $2p$ is coprime with q and p a prime bigger than 3. Looking on the orders of elements in $\mathrm{PSL}(2,q)$, cf. Theorem 2.2, one should not expect a better result for the Zassenhaus Conjecture for $\mathrm{PSL}(2,q)$ when applying only the HeLP Method. In fact to prove our results we do not use the HeLP Method in the classical sense, since this would imply too many case distinctions. For this reason we vary the method in a way suitable for the character theory of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,q)$.

We introduce in Section 2 the known results and the method we use and give a sketch of the proof there. The rest of the paper will then be devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2 which involves heavy technical calculations.

2. Preliminaries, Method and sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.2

Let G be a finite group. If $g \in G$, then $|g|$ denotes the order of g, the cyclic group generated by g is denoted by $\langle g \rangle$ and g^G denotes the conjugacy class of g in G. If R is a ring then RG denotes the group ring of G with coefficients in R. Denote by $V(\mathbb{Z}G)$ the group of normalized units (i.e units of augmentation 1) in $\mathbb{Z}G$. As mentioned above, we say that two elements of $\mathbb{Z}G$ are rationally conjugate if they are conjugate in the units of $\mathbb{Q}G$.

The main notion to study rational conjugacy of torsion units in $\mathbb{Z}G$ are the so called partial augmentations. If $\alpha = \sum_{g\in G} \alpha_g g$ is an element of a group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$, with each $\alpha_g \in \mathbb{Z}$, then the partial augmentation of α at g is defined as

$$\varepsilon_g(\alpha) = \sum_{h\in g^G} \alpha_h.$$

The relevance of partial augmentations for the study of the Zassenhaus Conjecture is provided by a result of Marciniak, Ritter, Sehgal and Weiss. The following theorem states this result and collects some known information about partial augmentations.

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a finite group and let u be an element of order n in $V(\mathbb{Z}G)$.*

1. [MRSW87, Theorem 2.5] *u is rationally conjugate to element in G if and only if $\varepsilon_g(u^d) \geq 0$ for all $g \in G$ and all divisors d of n.*
2. [JdR16, Proposition 1.5.1] *(Berman-Higman Theorem) If $u \neq 1$ then $\varepsilon_1(u) = 0$.*
3. [Her07, Theorem 2.3] *If $\varepsilon_g(u) \neq 0$ then $|g|$ divides $|u|$.*
4. [Her07, Theorem 3.2] *Let p be a prime not dividing n and let χ be a p-Brauer character of G associated to a modular representation $G \to M_m(k)$ for a suitable p-modular system (K,R,k). Then χ extends to a p-Brauer character defined on the p-regular torsion units of $\mathbb{Z}G$, associated to the natural algebra homomorphism $RG \to M_m(k)$. Moreover, if $g_1,...,g_k$ are representatives of the p-regular conjugacy classes of G then*

$$\chi(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon_{g_i}(u)\chi(g_i). \tag{2.1}$$

We collect the group theoretical properties of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,q)$ and its integral group ring relevant for us.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $G = \mathrm{PSL}(2,q)$ where $q = t^f$ for some prime t and let $d = \gcd(2,q)$.*

(1) [Hup67, Hauptsatz 8.27] *The order of G is $(q-1)q(q+1)/d$. The orders of elements in G are exactly t and the divisors of $(q+1)/d$ and $(q-1)/d$. Two cyclic subgroups of G are conjugate in G if and only if they have the same order. If $g \in G$ has order non divisible by t, then the only conjugates of g in $\langle g\rangle$ are g and g^{-1}. In particular a conjugacy class of elements of order coprime with t is a real conjugacy class.*

(2) *Let $u \in \mathrm{V}(\mathbb{Z}G)$ of order n. If $\gcd(n,q) = 1$ then G has an element of order n* [Her07, Proposition 6.7]. *If n is a prime power not divisible by t, then u is rationally conjugate to an element of G* [Mar16, Theorem 1]. *If moreover $f = 1$ and n is divisible by t, then $n = t$ and u is also rationally conjugate to an element of G* [Her07, Propositions 6.1, 6.3].

(3) [Mar16, Lemma 1.2] *Let n be a positive integer coprime with t and let $g \in G$ be an element of order n. There exists a primitive n-th root of unity α in a field of characteristic t such that for every positive integer m, there is a t-modular representation Θ_m of G of degree $1+2m$ such that*

$$\Theta_m(g) \text{ is conjugate to } \mathrm{diag}\left(1, \alpha, \alpha^{-1}, \alpha^2, \alpha^{-2}, \ldots, \alpha^m, \alpha^{-m}\right).$$

We denote by χ_m the Brauer character associated with Θ_m.

As mentioned in the introduction, we actually do not use the HeLP Method in its classical setting. We neither compute many inequalities involving traces as for example in the proofs of [Her07, Proposition 6.5] or [BKL08, Mar16], since these formulas get way to complicated in our setting. Nor do we apply the standard equations obtained from character values on one side and possible eigenvalues on the other side as e.g. in the proofs of [Her07, Propositions 6.4, 6.7], [Her08] or [BM14, Lemma 2.2], since there are too many possibilities for these possible eigenvalues. Still this second strategy is closer to our approach. The high degree of technicality we encounter even in our a priori easier approach, may give the reader an idea why the two classical ones were not suitable for us. We will first give a short sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.2 where we will introduce also some notation important for our approach.

In the remainder of this paper set $G = \mathrm{PSL}(2,t^f)$ with t prime. Our goal is to prove that any element u of order n in $V(\mathbb{Z}G)$, where n is greater than 1 and coprime with $2t$, is rationally conjugate to an element of G. We argue by induction on n. So we assume that u^d is rationally conjugate to an element of G for every divisor d of n with $d \neq 1$.

We will use the representations Θ_m and Brauer characters χ_m introduced in Theorem 2.2.(3). As usual in modular representation theory, a bijection between the complex roots of unity of order coprime with t and the roots of unity of the same order in a field of characteristic t has been fixed a priori. In this sense we will identify the eigenvalues of Θ_m and the summands in χ_m. Since units of prime order in $\mathrm{V}(\mathbb{Z}G)$ are rationally conjugate to elements of G by Theorem 2.2.(2), we know that the kernel of Θ_1 on $\langle u\rangle$ is trivial and hence $\Theta_1(u)$ has order n. As the values of χ_1 on t-regular elements of G are real, by Theorem 2.2.(1) and Theorem 2.1.(4), the set of eigenvalues of $\Theta_1(u)$ is closed under taking inverses (counting multiplicities). Therefore, $\Theta_1(u)$ is conjugate to $\mathrm{diag}(1,\zeta,\zeta^{-1})$ for a suitable primitive n-th root of unity ζ. Hence by Theorem 2.2 there exists an element $g_0 \in G$ of order n such that $\Theta_1(g_0)$ and $\Theta_1(u)$ are conjugate. Moreover for any positive integer m we know that

$$\Theta_m(g_0) \text{ is conjugate to } \mathrm{diag}\left(1, \zeta, \zeta^{-1}, \zeta^2, \zeta^{-2}, \ldots, \zeta^m, \zeta^{-m}\right), \tag{2.2}$$

and for every integer i we have

$$\chi_m(g_0^i) = \sum_{j=-m}^{m} \zeta^{ij}. \tag{2.3}$$

Observe that we are abusing the notation so that in (2.2), ζ denotes a primitive n-th root of unity in a field of characteristic t, while in (2.3), ζ denotes a complex primitive n-th root of unity.

The element $g_0 \in G$ and the primitive n-th root of unity ζ satisfying the conditions of the paragraph above will be fixed throughout.

For integers x and y we define

$$x \sim_m y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x \equiv \pm y \mod m,$$

which clearly is an equivalence relation on $\mathbb{Z}$. We denote by Γ_m the set of these equivalence classes.

By Theorem 2.2.(1), two elements of $\langle g_0 \rangle$ are conjugate in G if and only if they are equal or mutually inverse. Moreover, every element $g \in G$, with $g^n = 1$, is conjugate to an element of $\langle g_0 \rangle$. Therefore $x \mapsto (g_0^x)^G$ induces a bijection from Γ_n to the set of conjugacy classes of G formed by elements of order dividing n.

For an integer x (or $x \in \Gamma_n$) we set

$$\alpha_x = \zeta^x + \zeta^{-x}.$$

Observe that $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$ is the maximal real subfield of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$ is the ring of integers of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$. For a positive integer i let

$$\lambda_i = \sum_{x \in \Gamma_n} \varepsilon_{g_0^x}(u)\alpha_{ix}.$$

Lemma 2.3. *u is rationally conjugate to g_0 if and only if*

$$\lambda_i = \alpha_i, \text{ for any positive integer } i. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. If u is rationally conjugate to g_0, then $\varepsilon_{g_0}(u) = 1$ and $\varepsilon_{g_0^x}(u) = 0$ for any $x \in \Gamma_n \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore (2.4) holds. Conversely, assume that (2.4) holds. For $u' \in \mathrm{V}(\mathbb{Z}G)$ of order dividing n let $\lambda_i'(u') = \sum_{x \in \Gamma_n} \varepsilon_{g_0^x}(u')\alpha_{xi}$. Then $\lambda_i'(u) = \lambda_i$ and when viewed as characters of $\langle g_0 \rangle$ the λ_i' with $i = 0, 1, \ldots, \frac{n-1}{2}$ are the irreducible real characters of $\langle g_0 \rangle$. Thus, if $\lambda_i = \alpha_i$ for each i then we have $\chi(u) = \chi(g_0)$ for any (ordinary or t-regular) character χ of G by Theorem 2.2.(4). As the t-Brauer character table is invertible, by (2.3) we get that $\varepsilon_g(u) = \varepsilon_g(g_0) \geq 0$ for every t-regular element g of G. And hence, by Theorem 2.1.(3), $\varepsilon_g(u) \geq 0$ for every $g \in G$. As we are assuming that if d is a divisor of n different from 1 then u^d is rationally conjugate to an element of G, we also have $\varepsilon_g(u^d) \geq 0$ for every $g \in G$. Thus u is rationally conjugate to an element of $g \in G$ by Theorem 2.1.(1). Since g_0^G is the only conjugacy class of G having the same value for χ_1 as u, we conclude that u and g_0 are rationally conjugate. □

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.2: We will prove (2.4) by contradiction, so assume that $\lambda_d \neq \alpha_d$ for some positive integer d which we assume to be minimal with this property. Observe that if $\lambda_i = \alpha_i$ and j is an integer such that $\gcd(i, n) = \gcd(j, n)$, then there exists a $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)/\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\sigma(\alpha_i) = \alpha_j$ and applying σ to the equation $\lambda_i = \alpha_i$ we obtain $\lambda_j = \alpha_j$. This implies that d divides n. Note that $\alpha_1 = \lambda_1$ by our choice of g_0 and hence $d \neq 1$. Moreover, $d \neq n$ because from Theorem 2.1.(4), Theorem 2.2.(1) and the fact that the augmentation of u is 1, we have $\lambda_n = 2\sum_{x \in \Gamma_n} \varepsilon_{g_0^x} = 2 = \alpha_n$.

We will prove in Section 4 that

$$\lambda_d = \alpha_d + d\tau \text{ for some } \tau \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]. \tag{2.5}$$

This will be a consequence of a purely number theoretical result whose proof will occupy most of the paper. On the other hand by statements (3) and (4) of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 we know

$$\chi_d(u) = \sum_{x \in \Gamma_n} \varepsilon_{g_0^x}(u)\chi_d(g_0^x) = \sum_{x \in \Gamma_n} \varepsilon_{g_0^x}(u)\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ix}\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} \lambda_i. \tag{2.6}$$

By the induction hypothesis on u we know the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(u^c)$ for every $c \mid n$ with $c \neq 1$. This provides restrictions on the possible eigenvalues of the matrices $\Theta_d(u)$. Without completely determining these eigenvalues we show that (2.5) implies $\tau = 0$ and hence $\lambda_d = \alpha_d$ yielding the desired contradiction. $\square$

The proof of (2.5) will be very technical. In Section 3 we introduce the notation required for this proof and prove some technical facts for this notation. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of (2.5) and is the most complicated one to read. Finally in Section 5 we obtain restrictions on the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(u)$ which allows us to prove the main result. This last section, though a bit lengthy since we need to consider many exceptional cases, only uses very elementary calculations.

3. Notation and Technical Lemmas

In this section n denotes a positive odd integer. This n will later play the role of the order of the unit u, but this viewpoint may be ignored inside of this section. Many of the ingredients of this section make sense when we take n to be an even integer with small modifications. However this increases the technicality without any benefit for our purposes.

As usual we denote by μ the Möbius function. All throughout we reserve the letter p to denote positive prime integers. For a positive integer m we set

$$m' = \prod_{p \mid m} p, \quad m'' = \prod_{p, p^2 \mid m} p \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{m} = m/m''.$$

Moreover, m_p denotes the maximal power of p dividing m. If $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} m_x &= \prod_{p \mid x} m_p; \\ (x : m) &= \text{representative } y \text{ of the class of } x \text{ modulo } m \text{ with } -\frac{m}{2} < y \leq \frac{m}{2}; \\ |x : m| &= \text{absolute value of } (x : m). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly

$$\text{if } d \mid m \text{ then } ((x : d) : m) = ((x : m) : d) = (x : d). \tag{3.1}$$

For every $d \mid m$ let

$$\Gamma_{m,d} = \left\{ x \in \Gamma_m : \frac{m_p}{2pd_p} < |x : m_p| \leq \frac{m_p}{2d_p} \quad \text{for every prime } p \mid m \right\}.$$

Observe that we are abusing the notation by treating elements of Γ_m as integers. This is well defined because $|x : m_p|$ is constant in any $\sim_m$-class. Clearly $\{\Gamma_{m,d} : d \mid m\}$ is a partition of Γ_m. We define the *level* of $x \in \Gamma_m$ as the unique divisor $\ell_m(x)$ of m with $x \in \Gamma_{m,\ell_m(x)}$. We identify the elements of $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ with its representatives of the form $(x : m)$.

Most of the time m will be odd. In this case $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ is identified with the integers in the interval $\left[\frac{1-m}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2}\right]$ and

$$\Gamma_{m,d} = \left\{ x \in \Gamma_m : \frac{m_p}{pd_p} - 1 < 2\,|x : m_p| \leq \frac{m_p}{d_p} - 1 \quad \text{for every prime } p \mid m \right\}.$$

In the remainder d is a positive divisor of n and for each $x \in \Gamma_n$ we set

$$\ell(x) = \ell_n(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{d} = \prod_{p,\ n_p = d_p} d_p.$$

If, moreover, d divides $n/\ell(x)$ then we define $[x \uparrow d]$ as the only element of Γ_n such that for every prime $p \mid n$ we have

$$[x \uparrow d] \equiv \left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)d} \right)_p \right) \bmod n_p. \tag{3.2}$$

We first collect some elementary arithmetic properties of these objects.

Lemma 3.1. *Let p be a prime dividing n, let d and c be positive divisors of n and let $x \in \Gamma_n$. Then the following conditions hold:*

1. *If $d_p \mid \ell(x)$ then $\left(x : \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)_p \right) \equiv x \bmod n_p$. In particular, if $p \nmid d$ then $[x \uparrow d] \equiv x \bmod n_p$.*
2. *If d divides $\frac{n}{\ell(x)}$ then $d\ell(x)$ divides $\ell([x \uparrow d])$ (i.e. $[- \uparrow d]$ increases the level at least by a factor d).*
3. *If d and c are coprime divisors of $\frac{n}{\ell(x)}$ then $[[x \uparrow d] \uparrow c] = [x \uparrow dc]$.*
4. *Let $d \mid n'$ such that $x \equiv y \bmod \frac{n}{d}$. If d divides $\ell(x)$ and $\ell(y)$, then $x \equiv y \bmod n$.*

Proof. (1) If $d_p \mid \ell(x)$ then $2|x : n_p| \leq \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)_p - 1 \leq \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)_p - 1$ and hence

$$\left(x : \left(\frac{n}{d} \right)_p \right) = (x : n_p) \equiv x \bmod n_p.$$

(2) By (3.2) we get

$$2\,|[x \uparrow d] : n_p| \leq \left(\frac{n}{d\ell(x)} \right)_p - 1.$$

Therefore $(d\ell(x))_p \leq \ell([x \uparrow d])_p$ and hence $(d\ell(x))_p \mid \ell([x \uparrow d])_p$. As this holds for every prime p, we deduce that $d\ell(x) \mid \ell([x \uparrow d])$.

(3) We show that $[[x \uparrow d] \uparrow c] \equiv [x \uparrow dc] \bmod n_p$ for every p dividing n. This is a consequence of (1) if $p \nmid dc$. Suppose that $p \mid d$. Then $p \nmid c$ and, by (2), $\frac{n}{d\ell(x)}$ divides $\frac{n}{\ell([x\uparrow d])}$. Thus, by (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [[x \uparrow d] \uparrow c] &\equiv \left(\left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)d} \right)_p \right) : \left(\frac{n}{\ell\left([x \uparrow d]\right)} \right)_p \right) \equiv \left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)d} \right)_p \right) \\ &\equiv \left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)dc} \right)_p \right) \equiv [x \uparrow dc] \mod n_p. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that $p \mid c$. Then $p \nmid d$ and hence by (1) we have $\ell(x)_p = \ell([x \uparrow d])_p$. In this case we get

$$\begin{aligned} [[x \uparrow d] \uparrow c] &\equiv \left(\left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)} \right)_p \right) : \left(\frac{n}{\ell\left([x \uparrow d]\right)c} \right)_p \right) \equiv \left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)c} \right)_p \right) \\ &\equiv \left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)dc} \right)_p \right) \equiv [x \uparrow dc] \mod n_p. \end{aligned}$$

(4) As in the proof of (3), it is enough to prove $x \equiv y \bmod n_p$ for every p. This is clear if $p \nmid d$. Suppose otherwise that p divides d. Then $(x : n_p) \equiv x \equiv y \equiv (y : n_p) \mod \frac{n_p}{p}$. Therefore $|y : n_p| - |x : n_p| = i\frac{n_p}{p}$ for some $i \in \left[\frac{1-p}{2}, \frac{p-1}{2}\right]$. Since p divides $\ell(x)$ and $\ell(y)$, we know that $|x : n_p|, |y : n_p| < \frac{n_p}{2p}$. Hence $i = 0$ and therefore $x \equiv (x : n_p) = (y : n_p) \equiv y \bmod n_p$, as desired. □

For integers x and y we define

$$\delta^m_{x,y} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \sim_m y; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if d divides $\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}$ then we set

$$\Delta_{x,d} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''\right)\delta^{n}_{1,\left[x\uparrow\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right]}.$$

Note that $\left[x\uparrow\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right]$ makes sense, since d divides $\widetilde{n/\ell(x)} = \frac{n/\ell(x)}{(n/\ell(x))''}$ and hence $\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{(n/\ell(x))''}$ divides $\frac{n}{\ell(x)}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $x\in\Gamma_n$ and let d be a divisor of $\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}$. Then*

$$\Delta_{x,d} = \begin{cases} \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''\right)\delta_{1,x}^{\frac{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}{d\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}}, & \text{if } \widehat{d}=1 \text{ and } n_p \neq pd_p\ell(x)_p \text{ for every } p\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'';\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

In particular, if $\widehat{\ell(x)}=1$ then $\Delta_{x,1} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''\right)\delta_{1,x}^{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}$.

Proof. For every p we have

$$\left[x\uparrow\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right)_p\right] \equiv \left(x:\left(\frac{n/\ell(x)}{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}}\right)_p\right) = \left(x:\left(\frac{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}{d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}}\right)_p\right) \bmod n_p. \tag{3.3}$$

Thus, if there is $p\mid n$, such that either $p\mid\widehat{\ell(x)}$ or both $p\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''$ and $n_p = pd_p\ell(x)_p$, then

$$\left[x\uparrow\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right)_p\right] \equiv 0 \not\equiv \pm 1 \mod n_p$$

and hence $\Delta_{x,d}=0$.

Suppose otherwise that $\widehat{d}=1$ and $n_p\neq pd_p\ell(x)_p$ for every $p\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''$. We have to prove that

$$1=\delta^{n}_{1,\left[x\uparrow\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right]} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad 1=\delta_{1,x}^{\frac{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}{d\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}}.$$

The implication from left to right follows from (3.3). Suppose that $1=\delta_{1,x}^{\frac{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}{d\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}}$. Then there exists $\epsilon=\pm1$ such that $x\equiv\epsilon \mod \left(\frac{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}{d\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right)_p$ for every p. Moreover, the assumption implies that each p divides $\frac{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}{d\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}$ and hence $\left(x:\left(\frac{\widetilde{n/\ell(x)}}{d\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right)_p\right)=\epsilon$. Then, by (3.3), we have $\left[x\uparrow\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right)_p\right]\equiv\epsilon \mod n_p$ for every p. Thus $1=\delta^{n}_{1,\left[x\uparrow\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''d_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right]}$, as desired. □

For an integer x we fix an integer $D(x)\in\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ by imposing the following conditions for every $p\mid n$:

$$D(x)\equiv\frac{n_p}{\ell(x)_p} \bmod n_p.$$

Clearly $\gcd(n, D(x)) = \frac{n}{\ell(x)}$. For $e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}/\ell(x)\mathbb{Z}$ define

$$x(e,z) = ([x \uparrow e] + zD(x) : n).$$

Moreover, for each $z \in \mathbb{Z}/\ell(x)\mathbb{Z}$ let $z\#x \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ determined by the following conditions:

$$z\#x \equiv \begin{cases} x \bmod n_p, & \text{if } p \mid \frac{n}{d}; \\ z \bmod n_p, & \text{if } p \nmid \frac{n}{d}. \end{cases}$$

In Section 4 we will use the following technical lemma whose proof can be skipped without any loss of understanding of the rest of the paper.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $x \in \Gamma_n$ and let $d = \ell(x)$. Let h be a proper divisor of d and let $z \in \Gamma_{d,h}$ (i.e. $h = \ell_d(z)$). For each $f \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'$ and $e \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'$ set*

$$\begin{aligned} x(e) &= x(e,z); \\ f^* &= \left(n' \frac{d/h}{(d/h)'}\right)_f = \left(\frac{d}{h}\right)_f \cdot \prod_{p \nmid \frac{d}{h}} f_p = \left(\operatorname{lcm}\left(f, \frac{d}{h}\right)\right)_f; \\ l(f) &= h \cdot \left(\frac{d}{h}\right)_f = \prod_{p \mid f} d_p \cdot \prod_{p \nmid f} h_p. \end{aligned}$$

If $f \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'$ and $e \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)$ then the following statements hold:

(1) $\ell(x(e)) = h$.

(2) *If* $\gcd\left(f, \frac{d}{h}\right) = 1$ *then* $[x(e) \uparrow f^*] = x(ef)$ *and* $\left[x(e) \uparrow (f \cdot (d/h)')^*\right] = [x \uparrow ef]$.

(3) *If* $E \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)$ *and* $F \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'$ *then*

$$[x(e) \uparrow f^*] = [x(E) \uparrow F^*] \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad e = E \ \text{ and } \ f = F.$$

(4) *If f divides* $\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)'$ *and* $\gcd(e, f) = 1$ *then* $\ell([x(e) \uparrow f^*]) = l(f)$. *If, moreover, g divides* $\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'$ *then*

$$[([x(e) \uparrow f^*]) \uparrow g^{**}] = [x(e \cdot \gcd(f,g)) \uparrow \operatorname{lcm}(f,g)^*],$$

where

$$g^{**} = \left(n' \frac{d/\ell(f)}{(d/\ell(f))'}\right)_g = \left(\frac{d}{l(f)}\right)_g \cdot \prod_{p \nmid \frac{d}{l(f)}} g_p = \left(\operatorname{lcm}\left(g, \frac{d}{l(f)}\right)\right)_g.$$

(5) *If f divides* $\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)'$ *and* $\gcd(f, e) = 1$ *then*

$$\Delta_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*], \frac{d/l(f)}{(d/l(f))'}} = \begin{cases} \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)''\right) \delta_{1, z\#x}^{\widehat{d} \cdot \widetilde{n/d}}, & \text{if } e = \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{l(f)}\right) \text{ and } \gcd\left(f, \widehat{d}\right) = 1; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $f = 1$, we obtain in particular

$$\Delta_{x(e), \frac{d/h}{(d/h)'}} = \begin{cases} \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right) \delta_{1, z\#x}^{\widehat{d} \cdot \widetilde{n/d}}, & \text{if } e = \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{h}\right); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Set $D = D(x)$. In this proof we will have to show several times equalities between two integers x and y. Some of these integers are positive divisors of n. In this case we prove that $x_p = y_p$ for every $p \mid n$. In the other cases $x, y \in \left[\frac{1-n}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2}\right]$ and we will establish the equalities by showing $x \equiv y \mod n_p$ for every $p \mid n$. So in the remainder p is a prime dividing n.

(1) Assume first that p is not a divisor of $\frac{d}{h}$. In particular $e_p = 1$. Then $d_p = h_p$, implying $d_p \mid z_p$ by the definition of $\Gamma_{d,h}$. So $n_p \mid zD$ and having in mind that $\ell(x) = d$ we get, by Lemma 3.1.(1), that

$$x(e) = [x \uparrow e] + zD \equiv [x \uparrow e] \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv x \mod n_p.$$

Thus $\ell(x(e))_p = \ell(x)_p = d_p = h_p$.

Now assume that p divides $\frac{d}{h}$. Since $z \in \Gamma_{d,h}$, we have

$$\frac{d_p}{ph_p} + 1 \leq 2\,|z : d_p| \leq \frac{d_p}{h_p} - 1.$$

Multiplying with $D \equiv \frac{n_p}{d_p} \mod n_p$ we obtain

$$\frac{n_p}{ph_p} + \frac{n_p}{d_p} \leq 2\,|zD : n_p| \leq \frac{n_p}{h_p} - \frac{n_p}{d_p}. \tag{3.4}$$

Since $\ell([x \uparrow e])_p \geq \ell(x)_p$ and $\frac{n_p}{pd_p} - 1 < 2\,|x : n_p| \leq \frac{n_p}{d_p} - 1$ we have $2\,|[x \uparrow e] : n_p| \leq \frac{n_p}{d_p} - 1$. Using the left inequality in (3.4) we obtain

$$2\,|x(e) : n_p| = 2\,|[x \uparrow e] + zD : n_p| \geq \frac{n_p}{ph_p} + \frac{n_p}{d_p} - 2\,|[x \uparrow e] : n_p| \geq \frac{n_p}{ph_p} + \frac{n_p}{d_p} - \left(\frac{n_p}{d_p} - 1\right) > \frac{n_p}{ph_p} - 1.$$

Moreover, using the right inequality in (3.4), we have

$$2\,|x(e) : n_p| = 2\,|[x \uparrow e] + zD : n_p| \leq \frac{n_p}{h_p} - \frac{n_p}{d_p} + 2|\,[x \uparrow e] : n_p| \leq \frac{n_p}{h_p} - \frac{n_p}{d_p} + \frac{n_p}{d_p} - 1 = \frac{n_p}{h_p} - 1.$$

Therefore $\frac{n_p}{ph_p} - 1 < 2\,|x(e) : n_p| \leq \frac{n_p}{h_p} - 1$ and hence $\ell(x(e))_p = h_p$.

(2) Assume first that $p \nmid \frac{d}{h}$. Then $h_p = d_p$, $e_p = 1$ and $zD \equiv 0 \mod n_p$. Thus, having in mind (3.1) and (1), we get

$$[x(e) \uparrow f^*] \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p f_p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p f_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p f_p}\right) \mod n_p.$$

Moreover,

$$x(ef) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p (ef)_p}\right) + zD \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p f_p}\right) \mod n_p.$$

Otherwise, i.e. if $p \mid \frac{d}{h}$ then $f_p = 1$ and since $\ell(x(e)) = h$ by (1), we have as a consequence of Lemma 3.1.(1) that

$$[x(e) \uparrow f^*] \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p}\right) \equiv x(e) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD \mod n_p.$$

On the other hand

$$x(ef) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p (ef)_p}\right) + zD \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD \mod n_p.$$

This finishes the proof of the first equality in (2).

To prove the second equality let first p divide $\frac{d}{h}$. We will use (1) without further mention. We have $\left(\left(f \cdot (d/h)'\right)^*\right)_p = \frac{d_p}{h_p}$ and hence

$$\left[x(e) \uparrow (f \cdot (d/h)')^*\right] \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p \cdot (d_p/h_p)}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) \mod n_p.$$

Moreover $p \nmid f$ and thus

$$[x \uparrow ef] \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) \mod n_p.$$

Assume that $p \nmid \frac{d}{h}$. Then $\left(\left(f \cdot (d/h)'\right)^*\right)_p = f_p$, $e_p = 1$ and $h_p = d_p$, so

$$\left[x(e) \uparrow (f \cdot (d/h)')^*\right] \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p f_p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p f_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p f_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

On the other hand

$$[x \uparrow ef] \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p f_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

This finishes the proof of (2).

(3) The implication from right to left is obvious. So suppose that $[x(e) \uparrow f^*] = [x(E) \uparrow F^*]$. Let p be a prime dividing n. By (1), we have

$$[x(e) \uparrow f^*] \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{h_p (f^*)_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

Suppose $p \nmid \frac{d}{h}$. Then $e_p = 1 = E_p$ and $h_p (f^*)_p = d_p f_p$. So, in that case

$$[x(e) \uparrow f^*] \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p f_p}\right) \bmod n_p$$

and similarly $[x(E) \uparrow F^*] \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p F_p}\right) \bmod n_p$. Since $\ell(x)_p = d_p$ we have $\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \not\equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p p}\right) \bmod n_p$, implying $f_p = F_p$.

Assume p divides $\frac{d}{h}$. If p does not divide f then it also does not divide f^* and hence, by Lemma 3.1.(1), we have $[x(e) \uparrow f^*] \equiv x(e) \bmod n_p$. Therefore, $\ell([x(e) \uparrow f^*])_p = \ell(x(e))_p = h_p$, by (1). However, if p does divide f, then $(f^*)_p = \frac{d_p}{h_p}$ and $f^* \ell(x(e)) = f^* h$ divides $\ell([x(e) \uparrow f^*])$ by Lemma 3.1.(2). Thus, in this case $\ell\left([x(e) \uparrow f^*]\right)_p \geq d_p$. As the same holds for E and F, the assumption implies $f_p = F_p$. Since in this case $h_p (f^*)_p \leq d_p$, we have

$$0 = [x(e) \uparrow f^*] - [x(E) \uparrow F^*] \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) - \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p E_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

Since $\ell(x)_p = d_p$, we know $\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \not\equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p p}\right) \bmod n_p$, so $e_p = E_p$. This finishes the proof of (3).

(4) First assume that p does not divide $\frac{d}{h}$, hence also not dividing e nor f. Then, as in the computation before, using Lemma 3.1.(1) we obtain $\ell\left([x(e) \uparrow f^*]\right)_p = d_p = h_p = l(f)_p$. Suppose now that p divides f. Then $(f^*)_p = \frac{d_p}{h_p}$ and since $\ell(x(e)) = h$ by (1), we obtain

$$[x(e) \uparrow f^*] \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p \left(f^*\right)_p}\right) \equiv \left([x \uparrow e] + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv [x \uparrow e] \bmod n_p.$$

Since e and f are coprime, p does not divide e and so $[x \uparrow e] \equiv x \bmod n_p$ by Lemma 3.1.(3). Thus $\ell\left([x(e) \uparrow f^*]\right)_p = \ell(x)_p = d_p = l(f)_p$. Assume at last that p divides $\frac{d}{h}$, but not f. Then, by (1), $\ell\left([x(e) \uparrow f^*]\right)_p = \ell(x(e))_p = h_p = l(f)_p$.

Suppose now that g divides $\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'$. We will use several times (3.1), (1), Lemma 3.1.(1), the first statement of (4) and $D \equiv \frac{n_p}{d_p} \bmod n_p$ without specific mention.

Suppose first that p does not divide $\frac{d}{h}$ or divides f. Then $l(f)_p = d_p$ and p is not a divisor of e. Moreover $(g^{**})_p = g_p$. If $p \nmid f$ then $p \nmid \frac{d}{h}$ and hence $d_p = h_p = h_p (f^*)_p$. Otherwise, $p \mid \gcd\left(f, \frac{d}{h}\right)$ and hence $h_p (f^*)_p = d_p$, by the definition of f^*. So, in both cases, $h_p (f^*)_p = d_p$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}[[x(e) \uparrow f^*] \uparrow g^{**}] &\equiv \left([x(e) \uparrow f^*] : \frac{n_p}{l(f)_p g_p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p (f^*)_p}\right) : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) \\ &\equiv \left([x \uparrow e] + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) \bmod n_p.\end{aligned}$$

For the other side we consider separately the two cases of the previous paragraph. Assume firstly that $p \nmid \frac{d}{h}$. Then $h_p = d_p$, $(\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*)_p = g_p$ and $p \nmid e \cdot \gcd(f,g)$. Thus, using Lemma 3.1.(1), in this case, we get

$$[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) \uparrow \mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*] \equiv \left(x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) : \frac{n_p}{h_p g_p}\right) \equiv \left([x \uparrow e\cdot\gcd(f,g)] + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right)$$
$$\equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

Assume secondly that p divides f. Then $(\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*)_p = \frac{d_p}{h_p}$ and $(e\cdot\gcd(f,g))_p = g_p$. So in this case

$$[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) \uparrow \mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*] \equiv \left(x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) : \frac{n_p}{h_p\cdot(d_p/h_p)}\right) \equiv \left([x \uparrow e\cdot\gcd(f,g)] + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right)$$
$$\equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p g_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

In both cases $[[x(e)\uparrow f^*]\uparrow g^{**}] \equiv [x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g))\uparrow \mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*] \mod n_p$.

Next assume that p is a prime dividing $\frac{d}{h}$ and g, but not f. Then $l(f)_p = h_p$ and $(g^{**})_p = \frac{d_p}{l(f)_p} = \frac{d_p}{h_p}$. The arguments in this case are quite similar to the ones above, so we will not write all the congruences such explicitly. We have

$$[[x(e)\uparrow f^*]\uparrow g^{**}] \equiv \left([x(e)\uparrow f^*] : \frac{n_p}{l(f)_p (g^{**})_p}\right) \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right)$$
$$\equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

On the other hand $(\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*)_p = \frac{d_p}{h_p}$ and so

$$[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) \uparrow \mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*] \equiv \left(x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) : \frac{n_p}{h_p\cdot(d_p/h_p)}\right)$$
$$\equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

Assume finally that p is a prime dividing $\frac{d}{h}$ and not dividing f nor g. Then $l(f)_p = h_p$ and $(f^*)_p = (g^{**})_p = 1$. So

$$[[x(e)\uparrow f^*]\uparrow g^{**}] \equiv \left([x(e)\uparrow f^*] : \frac{n_p}{l(f)_p}\right) \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{h_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

Moreover $(\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*)_p = \gcd(f,g)_p = 1$ and so

$$[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) \uparrow \mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*] \equiv \left(x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g)) : \frac{n_p}{h_p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{h_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

(5) Let $\Delta = \Delta_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*], \frac{d/l(f)}{(d/l(f))'}}$. By (4), we have $\ell([x(e)\uparrow f^*]) = l(f)$ and so, by definition,

$$\Delta = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)''\right)\delta^n_{1,\gamma} \quad \text{with} \quad \gamma = \left[[x(e)\uparrow f^*] \uparrow \left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'' \left(\frac{d/l(f)}{(d/l(f))'}\right)_{\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)''}\right].$$

Note that

$$\left(\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'' \left(\frac{d/l(f)}{(d/l(f))'}\right)_{\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)''}\right)_p = \begin{cases} \frac{d_p}{h_p}, & \text{if } p \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'', \frac{d}{l(f)}\right); \\ p, & \text{if } p \mid \left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'' \text{ and } p \nmid \frac{d}{l(f)}; \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $p \mid e$ then $p \nmid f$ and hence $p \mid \frac{d_p}{h_p} = \frac{d_p}{l(f)_p}$. This shows that $e \mid \frac{d}{l(f)}$. Furthermore, since $f \mid \left(\frac{d}{h}\right)'$, for any p not dividing $\frac{d}{l(f)}$ we have $h_p(f^*)_p = d_p$.

We now calculate $(\gamma : n_p)$ for every prime p dividing n. We will use (1) and (4) several times. For that we consider four cases:

(i) Let first $p^2 \nmid \frac{n}{l(f)}$ and $d_p = l(f)_p$. Then $p \nmid e$ and hence

$$\gamma \equiv \left(x(e) : \frac{n_p}{h_p(f^*)_p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv x \mod n_p.$$

(ii) Next assume that $p^2 \nmid \frac{n}{l(f)}$ and $d_p \neq l(f)_p$. These assumptions imply that $p \nmid f$, $d_p = n_p$ and $l(f)_p = h_p = \frac{n_p}{p}$. In particular $x \equiv 0 \bmod n_p$ and $p \nmid e$. Then

$$\gamma \equiv [x(e) \uparrow f^*] \equiv x(e) = x + z \equiv z \mod n_p.$$

(iii) Now assume $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{l(f)}$ and $d_p = l(f)_p$. Thus $p \nmid e$ and $h_p(f^*)_p = d_p$. Then

$$\gamma \equiv \left([x(e) \uparrow f^*] : \frac{n_p}{d_p p}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) : \frac{n_p}{d_p p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

(iv) Finally, let $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{l(f)}$ and $d_p \neq l(f)_p$. In particular, $l(f)_p = h_p$ and $p \nmid f$. Then

$$\gamma \equiv \left([x(e) \uparrow f^*] : \frac{n_p}{l(f)_p(d_p/h_p)}\right) \equiv \left(\left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) + zD : \frac{n_p}{d_p}\right) \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) \bmod n_p.$$

So we have proved

$$\gamma \equiv \begin{cases} x \bmod n_p, & \text{if } p^2 \nmid \frac{n}{l(f)} \text{ and } d_p = l(f)_p; \quad (i) \\ z \bmod n_p, & \text{if } p^2 \nmid \frac{n}{l(f)} \text{ and } d_p \neq l(f)_p; \quad (ii) \\ \left(x : \frac{n_p}{pd_p}\right) \bmod n_p, & \text{if } p^2 \mid \frac{n}{l(f)} \text{ and } d_p = l(f)_p; \quad (iii) \\ \left(x : \frac{n_p}{e_p d_p}\right) \bmod n_p, & \text{if } p^2 \mid \frac{n}{l(f)} \text{ and } d_p \neq l(f)_p. \quad (iv) \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

Suppose that $\widehat{h} \neq 1$ or $\gcd\left(f \cdot \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'', \widehat{d}\right) \neq 1$. Then there is a prime p with $n_p = d_p$ and either $p \mid f$ or $p \mid \widehat{h}$ or $p \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''$. In the first case, $n_p = l(f)_p$, so that $\widehat{l(f)} \neq 1$, hence $\Delta = 0$, by Lemma 3.2. In the second case $z\#x \equiv z \equiv 0 \mod n_p$ and so $\delta_{1,z\#x}^{\widehat{d}\cdot\widehat{n/d}} = 0$. But since in this case also $d_p = l(f)_p$, we have $\widehat{l(f)} \neq 1$ and so $\Delta = 0$ by Lemma 3.2. In the third case $\ell(1)_p = \frac{n_p}{p} > \ell(z)_p$, so that $\delta_{1,z\#x}^{\widehat{d}\cdot\widehat{n/d}} = 0$. On the other hand, $p \nmid f$, $p \mid \left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'' = \left(\frac{n}{\ell([x(e)\uparrow f^*])}\right)''$ and $\left(\frac{d/l(f)}{(d/l(f))'}\right)_p = \frac{n_p}{p\ell([x(e)\uparrow f^*])_p}$. So by Lemma 3.2, $\Delta = 0$. This finishes the proof in this case.

So, for the rest of the proof we assume $\widehat{h} = 1$ and $\gcd\left(f \cdot \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'', \widehat{d}\right) = 1$. We now recalculate $(\gamma : n_p)$ considering separately the three mutually exclusive cases: $n_p = d_p$, $n_p = pd_p$ and $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{d}$.

Assume $n_p = d_p$. Then $x \equiv 0 \bmod n_p$ and we are clearly not in case (iii). Since by assumption $\gcd\left(f, \widehat{d}\right) = 1$ and $\widehat{h} = 1$, we are also not in case (i). Moreover since $\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'', \widehat{d}\right) = 1$, we are also not in case (iv). This proves that

$$\text{if } n_p = d_p \text{ then } \gamma \equiv z \bmod n_p. \tag{3.6}$$

Suppose now that $n_p = pd_p$. Then we are not in case (iii). Furthermore, if $p \mid \frac{d}{l(f)}$ then $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{l(f)}$, so we are not in case (ii) either. Recall that $e \mid \frac{d}{l(f)}$, so if we are in case (i) then $p \nmid e$. Furthermore, if we are in case (iv) and $p \mid e$ then $\gamma \equiv 0 \not\equiv \pm 1 \mod n_p$ and $\Delta = 0$. This proves the following:

$$\text{Suppose } n_p = pd_p. \text{ If } p \nmid e \text{ then } \gamma \equiv x \bmod n_p \text{ and if } p \mid e \text{ then } \Delta = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Finally, suppose that $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{d}$. Then we are in case (iii) or (iv) above and $d_p \mid \frac{n_p}{p^2}$ while $\ell(1)_p = \frac{n_p}{p}$. Therefore, $x \not\equiv \pm 1 \bmod n_p$ and hence, in case (iv), if $p \nmid e$ then $\Delta = 0$. This proves the following:

(3.8) If $\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{l(f)}\right) \nmid e$ then $\Delta = 0$. If $\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{l(f)}\right) \mid e$ and $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{d}$ then $\gamma \equiv \left(x : \frac{n_p}{pd_p}\right) \bmod n_p$.

Suppose that $e \neq \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{l(f)}\right)$. Then, as $e \mid \frac{d}{l(f)}$, there is a prime p such that either $p \mid e$ and $p^2 \nmid \frac{n}{d}$ or $p \nmid e$ and $p \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{l(f)}\right)$. In the first case, by (3.7), $\Delta = 0$ and in the second case, by (3.8), also $\Delta = 0$. Thus in both cases $\Delta = 0$.

Suppose otherwise that $e = \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{l(f)}\right)$. We have to show that $\delta^n_{1,\gamma} = 1$ if and only if $\delta^{\widehat{d}\cdot\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,z\#x} = 1$. On the one hand,

$$\left(\widehat{d}\cdot\widetilde{n/d}\right)_p = \begin{cases} n_p, & \text{if } d_p = n_p; \\ p, & \text{if } pd_p = n_p; \\ \frac{n_p}{d_p p}, & \text{if } p^2 \mid \frac{n}{d}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\delta^{\widehat{d}\cdot\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,z\#x} = 1$ if and only if there is $\epsilon = \pm 1$ such that for every p we have

$$\epsilon \equiv \begin{cases} z \bmod n_p, & \text{if } n_p = d_p; \\ x \bmod p, & \text{if } n_p = pd_p; \\ x \bmod \frac{n_p}{pd_p}, & \text{if } p^2 \mid \frac{n}{d}. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, using (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8) we deduce that $\delta^n_{1,\gamma} = 1$ if and only if there is $\epsilon = \pm 1$ such that for every p we have

$$\epsilon \equiv \begin{cases} z \bmod n_p, & \text{if } n_p = d_p; \\ x \bmod n_p, & \text{if } n_p = pd_p; \\ \left(x : \frac{n_p}{pd_p}\right) \bmod n_p, & \text{if } p^2 \mid \frac{n}{d}. \end{cases}$$

Observe that as $d = \ell(x)$, if $n_p = pd_p$ then $2|x : n_p| \leq p - 1$ and therefore $x \equiv \epsilon \mod n_p$ if and only if $(x : n_p) = \epsilon$ if and only if $x \equiv \epsilon \mod p$. This proves that $\delta^n_{1,\gamma} = 1$ if and only if $\delta^{\widehat{d}\cdot\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,z\#x} = 1$, as desired. □

For every $x \in \Gamma_n$ with $d = \ell(x)$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ define

$$\beta_{x,z} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } z = 0; \\ \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\delta^{\widehat{d}\cdot\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,z\#x}, & \text{if } z \neq 0 \text{ and } \gcd\left(\frac{n}{d}, \frac{d}{\ell_d(z)}\right) = 1; \\ -\Delta_{x,1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x \in \Gamma_n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\ell(x) = d$. Then*

$$\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{x,z} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\delta^{\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,x} - d\Delta_{x,1} = \begin{cases} (1-d)\Delta_{x,1} = (1-d)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\delta^{\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,x}, & \text{if } \widehat{d} = 1; \\ \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\delta^{\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,x}, & \text{if } \widehat{d} \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, it is enough to show that if $\widehat{d} = 1$ then $\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{x,z} = (1-d)\Delta_{x,1}$ and otherwise $\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{x,z} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\delta^{\widetilde{n/d}}_{1,x}$. If $\widehat{d} = 1$ and $z \neq 0$ then $1 \neq \left(\frac{d}{\ell_d(z)}\right)' \mid \gcd\left(\frac{n}{d}, \frac{d}{\ell_d(z)}\right)$ and hence $\beta_{x,z} = -\Delta_{x,1}$. Thus, if $\widehat{d} = 1$ then $\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{x,z} = (1-d)\Delta_{x,1}$, as desired.

Suppose otherwise that $\widehat{d} \neq 1$. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$z_0 \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \bmod d_p, & \text{if } n_p = d_p; \\ 0 \bmod d_p, & \text{if } n_p \neq d_p. \end{cases}$$

As $\widehat{d} \neq 1$, we have $z_0 \neq 0$ and, as d is odd, $z_0 \not\equiv -z_0 \mod d$. Suppose that $\beta_{x,z} \neq 0$. Then combining the definition of $\beta_{x,z}$ with Lemma 3.2 we have $\gcd\left(\frac{n}{d}, \frac{d}{\ell_d(z)}\right) = 1$. This implies that for any prime p satisfying $n_p \neq d_p$ we have $0 \equiv z \mod d_p$. Moreover there is $\epsilon_z = \pm 1$ such that if $n_p \neq d_p$ then $x \equiv \epsilon_z \bmod \widetilde{(n/d)}_p$ and if $n_p = d_p$ then $z \equiv \epsilon_z \mod d_p$. Therefore $\beta_{x,z} = 0$ for every $z \not\equiv \pm z_0 \mod d$. If $x \not\sim_{\widetilde{n/d}} 1$ then $\delta_{1,x}^{\widetilde{n/d}} = \beta_{x,z_0} = \beta_{x,-z_0} = 0$ and hence $\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{x,z} = 0$, as desired. Otherwise, $\delta_{1,x}^{\widetilde{n/d}} = 1$ and since $n \neq d$ there is a fixed $\epsilon = \pm 1$ with $x \equiv \epsilon \mod \widetilde{n/d}$. If $\epsilon = 1$ then $\beta_{x,z_0} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)$ and $\beta_{x,-z_0} = 0$ and otherwise $\beta_{x,-z_0} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)$ and $\beta_{x,z_0} = 0$. In both cases $\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{x,z} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)$. □

4. Proof of (2.5)

The goal of this section is the proof of (2.5). Actually we will prove the following purely number theoretical lemma which, when specialized to $\varepsilon_x = \varepsilon_{g_0^x}(u)$, gives (2.5) at once:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $n > 1$ be an odd integer and for every $x \in \Gamma_n$ let ε_x be an integer. For every integer i define*

$$\lambda_i = \sum_{x \in \Gamma_n} \varepsilon_x \alpha_{ix}.$$

Let d be a proper divisor of n such that $\lambda_i = \alpha_i$ for every $1 \leq i < d$. Then $\lambda_d = \alpha_d + d\tau$ for some $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$.

Sketch of the proof of Lemma 4.1: The τ in Lemma 4.1 will be constructed using the following integers:

$$\tau_x = \sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]} - \Delta_{x,1} \quad (x \in \Gamma_n). \tag{4.1}$$

In Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 we will assume that for a divisor d of n we have $\tau_y = 0$ for every $y \in \Gamma_n$ such that $\ell(y)$ is a proper divisor of d and deduce from this assumption an expression of ε_y for each y with $\ell(y)$ a proper divisor of d and a relation between each $\varepsilon_{x(e,z)}$ with $z \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ and $\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]}$ for the $x \in \Gamma_n$ with $\ell(x) = d$. Observe that for a fix x and e there are d values for $x(e,z)$ and only one for $\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]}$. This is the ultimate reason of the appearance of the factor d in Lemma 4.1.

In Lemma 4.4 we will show that $B = \{\alpha_b : b \in \Gamma_{n,1}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$ (and in particular a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$). For every $a \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$ and $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$ let $C_b(a)$ denote the coefficient of $\alpha_b \in B$ in the expression of a in B.

We denote by $\sigma(d)$ an element of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sigma(d)_p \equiv d_p \bmod n_p$ for any prime p dividing n. In Lemma 4.6 we will prove that for every $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$ such that $\frac{d}{\widehat{d}'} \mid b$ there is $x(b) \in \Gamma_{n,d}$ such that

$$C_b(\lambda_{\sigma(d)}) = C_b(\alpha_{\sigma(d)}) + d\mu\left(\widehat{d}'\right)\tau_{x(b)}.$$

We finish the proof of Lemma 4.1 by first setting $\tau' = \sum_{b \in \Gamma_{n,1}, \frac{d}{\widehat{d}'} \mid b} \mu\left(\widehat{d}'\right)\tau_{x(b)} \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$, where $x(b)$ is as above if $\frac{d}{\widehat{d}'} \mid b$ and 0 otherwise. We will show in Lemma 4.4 that if $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$ but $\frac{d}{\widehat{d}'} \nmid b$ then $C_b(\lambda_{\sigma(d)}) = C_b(\alpha_{\sigma(d)}) = 0$. Thus $\lambda_{\sigma(d)} = \alpha_{\sigma(d)} + d\tau'$. On the other hand $\gcd(\sigma(d), n) = d$ and therefore there is $\rho \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)/\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\rho(\alpha_{\sigma(d)}) = \alpha_d$ and $\rho(\lambda_{\sigma(d)}) = \lambda_d$. Therefore $\tau = \rho(\tau') \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$ and $\lambda_d = \alpha_d + d\tau$, as desired. □

From now on n is an odd integer greater than 1 and ε_x is an integer for each $x \in \Gamma_n$. We proceed to prove the lemmas mentioned in the sketch of the proof of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. *Let d be a divisor of n and suppose that $\tau_x = 0$ for every $x \in \Gamma_n$ with $\ell(x)$ a proper divisor of d. Let $x \in \Gamma_n$ such that $\ell(x)$ is a proper divisor of d. Then*

$$\varepsilon_x = \Delta_{x,\frac{d/\ell(x)}{(d/\ell(x))'}} - \sum_{\substack{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)' \\ e \neq 1}} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{\left[x\uparrow\left(\operatorname{lcm}\left(e,\frac{d}{\ell(x)}\right)\right)_e\right]}.$$

Proof. We will prove a stronger result, namely we will show that

$$\sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'f)_e]} = \Delta_{x,f}, \tag{4.2}$$

for every $x \in \Gamma_n$ with $\ell(x)$ a proper divisor of d and every divisor f of $\frac{d/\ell(x)}{(d/\ell(x))'}$. Observe that if $f = \frac{d/\ell(x)}{(d/\ell(x))'}$ then $(n'f)_e = \left(\operatorname{lcm}\left(e, \frac{d}{\ell(x)}\right)\right)_e$. So the statement of the lemma is the specialization of (4.2) to this particular case.

We argue by contradiction. So suppose that (4.2) fails for some $x \in \Gamma_n$, such that $\ell(x)$ is a proper divisor of d, and some divisor f of $\frac{d/\ell(x)}{(d/\ell(x))'}$. We assume that $\ell(x)$ is maximum among the $x \in \Gamma_n$ for which there exists such f and that f is minimal for such x. Observe that for $f = 1$ (4.2) holds by assumption, since in this case it is equivalent to $\tau_x = 0$. Therefore $f \neq 1$ and hence $f = pk$ for some prime p and some positive integer k. By the minimality of f we have

$$\sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'k)_e]} = \Delta_{x,k}. \tag{4.3}$$

Clearly $[x \uparrow (n'k)_p] = [x \uparrow f_p]$ and $[x \uparrow (n'f)_p] = [x \uparrow pf_p]$.

We claim that $[x \uparrow f_p] \neq [x \uparrow pf_p]$. Assume otherwise that $[x \uparrow f_p] = [x \uparrow pf_p]$. Then for every $e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'$ we have

$$\left[x \uparrow (n'k)_e\right] = \left[x \uparrow (n'f)_e\right]. \tag{4.4}$$

Indeed, if $p \nmid e$ then clearly (4.4) holds. Suppose $e = pe_0$, so $p \nmid e_0$. Then $(n'k)_e = f_p(n'k)_{e_0} = f_p(n'f)_{e_0}$ and $(n'f)_e = pf_p(n'f)_{e_0}$. By Lemma 3.1.(3), if $[x \uparrow f_p] = [x \uparrow pf_p]$ then

$$\left[x \uparrow (n'k)_e\right] = \left[[x \uparrow f_p] \uparrow (n'f)_{e_0}\right] = \left[[x \uparrow pf_p] \uparrow (n'f)_{e_0}\right] = \left[x \uparrow (n'f)_e\right].$$

So (4.4) follows. Using (4.4) for $e = \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''$, we obtain

$$\left[x \uparrow \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'' k_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right] = \left[x \uparrow (n'k)_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right] = \left[x \uparrow (n'f)_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right] = \left[x \uparrow \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'' f_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right]$$

and thus $\Delta_{x,k} = \Delta_{x,f}$. Therefore, by the minimality of f and (4.4), we have

$$\sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'f)_e]} = \sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'k)_e]} = \Delta_{x,k} = \Delta_{x,f},$$

contradicting the hypothesis on x and f. This finishes the proof of the claim.

Thus $[x \uparrow f_p] \neq [x \uparrow pf_p]$. Therefore

$$\left(x : \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)f_p}\right)_p\right) \neq \left(x : \left(\frac{n}{p\ell(x)f_p}\right)_p\right),$$

and hence $p\ell(x)f_p \nmid \ell([x \uparrow f_p])$. By Lemma 3.1.(2), $\ell(x)f_p \mid \ell([x \uparrow f_p])$, and we deduce that

$$\ell([x \uparrow f_p]) = \ell(x)f_p. \tag{4.5}$$

Hence

$$[x\uparrow pf_p] = [[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow p]\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Let $h = f_{n'/p} = k_{n'/p}$. Then, using (4.5), we have

$$h \mid \left(\frac{d/\ell(x)}{(d/\ell(x))'}\right)_{\frac{n'}{p}} = \left(\frac{d/f_p\ell(x)}{(d/f_p\ell(x))'}\right)_{\frac{n'}{p}} \mid \frac{d/f_p\ell(x)}{(d/f_p\ell(x))'} = \frac{d/\ell([x\uparrow f_p])}{(d/\ell([x\uparrow f_p]))'}$$

and $\ell([x\uparrow f_p]) > \ell(x)$. Note that $\ell(x)f_p$ is a divisor of $\frac{d}{\left(\frac{d}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mid \frac{d}{p}$ and so $\ell([x\uparrow f_p])$ is a proper divisor of d. By the maximality of $\ell(x)$ we thus get

$$\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)f_p}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow(n'h)_e]} = \Delta_{[x\uparrow f_p],h}.$$

Moreover $f \mid \frac{n/\ell(x)}{(n/\ell(x))'}$ and hence $\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)f_p}\right)' = \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'$. So, the previous equality takes the form

$$\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow(n'h)_e]} = \Delta_{[x\uparrow f_p],h}. \tag{4.7}$$

If $p\nmid e$ then, having in mind Lemma 3.1.(3) and (4.6), we get

$$\begin{gathered}\left[x\uparrow(n'f)_e\right] = \left[x\uparrow(n'k)_e\right], \qquad \left[x\uparrow(n'f)_{pe}\right] = \left[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow(n'h)_{pe}\right], \\ [x\uparrow ef_{pe}] = \left[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow(n'h)_e\right] \quad\text{and}\quad [x\uparrow ef_{pe}] = \left[x\uparrow(n'k)_{pe}\right].\end{gathered}$$

Combining this with (4.3) and (4.7) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'f)_e]} &= \sum_{\substack{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)' \\ p\nmid e}} \mu(e)\left(\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'f)_e]} - \varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'f)_{pe}]} + \varepsilon_{[x\uparrow ef_{pe}]} - \varepsilon_{[x\uparrow ef_{pe}]}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)' \\ p\nmid e}} \mu(e)\left(\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'k)_e]} - \varepsilon_{[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow(n'h)_{pe}]} + \varepsilon_{[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow(n'h)_e]} - \varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'k)_{pe}]}\right) \\ &= \sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow(n'k)_e]} + \sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow(n'h)_e]} = \Delta_{x,k} + \Delta_{[x\uparrow f_p],h}.\end{aligned}$$

We proceed to show that

$$\Delta_{x,k} + \Delta_{[x\uparrow f_p],h} = \Delta_{x,f} \tag{4.8}$$

and this will yield the final contradiction. Since $p \mid f$ and $f \mid \frac{d/\ell(x)}{(d/\ell(x))'}$, we have $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(x)}$ and $\ell(x)_p f_p \mid \frac{n_p}{p}$. First assume that $\ell(x)_p f_p p = n_p$. In that case, $\Delta_{x,f} = 0$, by Lemma 3.2. Moreover, by Lemma 3.1.(3) and (4.5), we get

$$\left[x\uparrow\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'' k_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right] = \left[[x\uparrow f_p]\uparrow\left(\frac{n}{\ell([x\uparrow f_p])}\right)'' h_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell([x\uparrow f_p])}\right)''}\right]$$

and using again (4.5) we have

$$\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''\right) = -\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)f_p}\right)''\right) = -\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell([x\uparrow f_p])}\right)''\right),$$

so $\Delta_{x,k} = -\Delta_{[x\uparrow f_p],h}$, proving (4.8) in this case.

Finally, assume that $\ell(x)_p f_p p < n_p$. Since $[x \uparrow f_p] \neq [x \uparrow pf_p]$, this implies that $[x \uparrow f_p] \not\equiv \pm 1, 0 \mod n_p$ and hence $[x \uparrow pk_p] \not\equiv \pm 1 \mod n_p$, so $\Delta_{x,k} = 0$. Moreover in this case we have by (4.6) that

$$\left[x \uparrow \left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)'' f_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''}\right] = \left[[x \uparrow f_p] \uparrow \left(\frac{n}{\ell([x \uparrow f_p])}\right)'' h_{\left(\frac{n}{\ell([x\uparrow f_p])}\right)''}\right]$$

and by (4.5)

$$\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)}\right)''\right) = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell(x)f_p}\right)''\right) = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{\ell([x \uparrow f_p])}\right)''\right),$$

proving that $\Delta_{x,f} = \Delta_{[x\uparrow f_p],h}$ and hence (4.8) holds. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $x \in \Gamma_n$ and $\ell(x) = d$ and assume that for every proper divisor c of d and any $y \in \Gamma_{n,c}$ we have $\tau_y = 0$. Then for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e,z)} = \beta_{x,z} + \sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]}.$$

Proof. If $z = 0$ then, by definition of the $x(e,z)$, we have $x(e,0) = [x \uparrow e]$. So the Lemma holds in this case. Assume $z \neq 0$ and let $h = \ell_d(z)$. Thus h is a proper divisor of d. We will use the notation of Lemma 3.3. Moreover, let

$$e_0 = \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'', \frac{d}{h}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \delta_{1,z\#x}^{\widehat{d}\cdot\widetilde{n/d}}.$$

For a positive integer k let $L(k)$ denote the number of primes dividing k and $\frac{d}{h}$.

For non-negative integers $k > l$ we understand $\binom{l}{k}$ to be 0. We will frequently use the identity

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} = -(-1)^k. \tag{4.9}$$

First we prove the following:

$$\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta \sum_{i=0}^{L(d/h)-1} (-1)^i \binom{L(n/d)}{i} = \beta_{x,z} \tag{4.10}$$

We consider three cases depending on the value of $L(n/d)$. Assume first that $L(n/d) = 0$, i.e. $\gcd\left(\frac{n}{d}, \frac{d}{h}\right) = 1$. In this case $e_0 = 1$ and so the left side of (4.10) becomes $\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta$ and the right side is $\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\delta$. We claim that if $\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right) \neq \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)$ then $\delta = 0$, which would provide the needed equality in this case. Indeed, if $\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right) \neq \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)$ then there exists a prime p such that $p \mid \frac{d}{h}$ and $p^2 \mid \frac{n}{h}$. Since $\gcd\left(\frac{n}{d}, \frac{d}{h}\right) = 1$, we have $p \nmid \frac{n}{d}$, so $n_p = d_p$ and $p^2 \mid \frac{d}{h}$. Also in this case $z\#x \equiv z \mod n_p$. But since $p^2 \mid \frac{d}{h}$ we know that $z \not\equiv \pm 1 \mod d_p$, so $z\#x \not\equiv \pm 1 \mod n_p$ and thus $\delta = 0$.

Next assume that $1 \leq L(n/d) < L(d/h)$. Then the left side in (4.10) is 0 because $\sum_{i=0}^{L(d/h)} (-1)^i \binom{L(n/d)}{i} = \sum_{i=0}^{L(n/d)} (-1)^i \binom{L(n/d)}{i} = 0$. On the other hand, in this case $\widehat{d} \neq 1$, and therefore the right side of (4.10) is $-\Delta_{x,1} = 0$, by Lemma 3.2.

Finally, assume $L(n/d) = L(d/h)$. In this case the right side of (4.10) is $-\Delta_{x,1}$. A case-by-case argument shows that if $p \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''$ then p divides exactly one or exactly three of the following numbers: e_0, $\frac{d}{h}$ and $\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''$; and if $p \nmid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''$ then it divides none or exactly two of them. This shows that $\mu\left(\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)'\right)\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right) = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)$.

Using this and (4.9) we obtain

$$\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta\sum_{i=0}^{L(d/h)-1}(-1)^i\binom{L(n/d)}{i} = -(-1)^{L(d/h)}\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta$$
$$= -\mu\left(\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)'\right)\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta = -\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\delta.$$

Suppose first that $\widehat{d}\neq 1$. Then there exists $p\mid n$, such that $n_p = d_p$ and since $L(n/d) = L(d/h)$, this implies $d_p = h_p$. Then $z\#x \equiv z \equiv 0 \mod n_p$, so $\delta = 0$. But since in this case also $\Delta_{x,1} = 0$, by Lemma 3.2, the equality (4.10) follows. Otherwise, i.e. in case $\widehat{d} = 1$, we have $\delta = \delta_{1,x}^{\widetilde{n/d}}$ and then (4.10) follows again from Lemma 3.2. This finishes the proof of (4.10).

Observe that if $f\mid \frac{n}{h}$ then $L(f) = L(\frac{d}{h})$ if and only if f is a multiple of $\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)'$. So

$$\mu(f) = \mu((d/h)')\mu\left(\gcd\left(f,\frac{n'}{(d/h)'}\right)\right) = (-1)^{L(d/h)}\mu\left(\gcd\left(f,\frac{n'}{(d/h)'}\right)\right).$$

This equation together with (4.9) yield the first equality in the next calculations and Lemma 3.3.(2) yields the third equality:

$$\sum_{e\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{i=0}^{L(d/h)-1}(-1)^i\binom{L(d/h)}{i}\sum_{\substack{f\mid\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\\ L(f)=L(d/h)}}\mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]}$$

$$= -\sum_{e\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)(-1)^{L(d/h)}\sum_{\substack{f\mid\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\\ L(f)=L(d/h)}}(-1)^{L(d/h)}\mu\left(\gcd\left(f,\frac{n'}{(d/h)'}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]} \tag{4.11}$$

$$= -\sum_{e\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{f\mid\gcd\left(\frac{n'}{(d/h)'},\frac{n}{h}\right)}\mu(f)\varepsilon_{\left[x(e)\uparrow(f\cdot(d/h)')^*\right]}$$

$$= -\sum_{e\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{f\mid\gcd\left(\frac{n'}{(d/h)'},\frac{n}{h}\right)}\mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow ef]} = -\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]}.$$

We will prove, by induction on k, the following equality for every $1\leq k\leq L\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)$:

$$\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e)} = \mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(-1)^i\binom{L(n/d)}{i} - \tag{4.12}$$

$$\left(\sum_{e\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{l=k}^{L(d/h)}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(-1)^i\binom{l}{i}\sum_{\substack{f\mid\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\\ L(f)=l}}\mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]}\right).$$

By (4.11), the specialization of (4.12) for $k = L\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)$ takes the form

$$\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e)} = \mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta\sum_{i=0}^{L(d/h)-1}(-1)^i\binom{L(n/d)}{i} + \sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]}$$

and the lemma follows from (4.10).

We proceed by proving (4.12) for $k=1$. By Lemma 3.3.(1), if $e \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)$ then $\ell(x(e)) = h$ which is a proper divisor of d, so we can apply Lemma 4.2 for $x(e)$. Observe that for such e we have

$$\left\{\operatorname{lcm}\left(E, \frac{d}{h}\right)_e : E \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\right\} = \left\{f^* : f \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\right\}.$$

Therefore

$$\varepsilon_{x(e)} = \Delta_{x(e),\frac{d/h}{(d/h)'}} - \sum_{\substack{f \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)' \\ f \neq 1}} \mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.3.(5), we have $\Delta_{x(e),\frac{d/h}{(d/h)'}} = 0$ for $e \neq e_0$, while $\Delta_{x(e_0),\frac{d/h}{(d/h)'}} = \mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta$. This proves the following equations where in the second equality we rename the summation index:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e)} &= \sum_{e \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e)} + \sum_{\substack{e \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)' \\ e \nmid \frac{d}{h}}} \mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e)} \\
&= \mu(e_0)\Delta_{x(e_0),\frac{d/h}{(d/h)'}} - \sum_{e \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{f \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)' \\ f \neq 1}} \mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]} + \sum_{\substack{E \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)' \\ E \nmid \frac{d}{h}}} \mu(E)\varepsilon_{x(E)} \\
&= \mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta - \sum_{e \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{f \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)' \\ L(f) \geq 1}} \mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]} - \sum_{e \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{f \mid \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)' \\ L(f)=0, f \neq 1}} \mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{E \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)' \\ E \nmid \frac{d}{h}}} \mu(E)\varepsilon_{x(E)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since for $k=1$ we have $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(-1)^i\binom{l}{i} = 1$ for any l, in order to finish the proof of (4.12) for $k=1$ it remains to show that the last two sums cancel each other. Let e, f, E be as in the last two sums. In particular $L(f) = 0$ implies that f is coprime with $\frac{d}{h}$ and e. Then by Lemma 3.3.(2) we have

$$[x(e) \uparrow f^*] = x(ef).$$

So splitting E into two factors, one being a divisor of $\frac{d}{h}$ and the other coprime with $\frac{d}{h}$, and rewriting we get

$$\sum_{\substack{E \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)' \\ E \nmid \frac{d}{h}}} \mu(E)\varepsilon_{x(E)} = \sum_{E \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)} \mu(E) \sum_{\substack{F \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', F \neq 1 \\ \gcd\left(F, \frac{d}{h}\right) = 1}} \mu(F)\varepsilon_{x(EF)} = \sum_{E \mid \gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', \frac{d}{h}\right)} \mu(E) \sum_{\substack{F \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)', F \neq 1 \\ L(F)=0}} \mu(F)\varepsilon_{x(EF)};$$

as desired. Thus the first induction step of (4.12) is done.

So assume that (4.12) holds for some $k < L(d/h)$. We start rewriting the last sum in (4.12). For that we split the summands in three types. In the first one we take the summands with $l = k$, $f \mid \frac{d}{h}$ and $\gcd(e, f) = 1$. In the second one we take the other summands with $l = k$ and in the third one we take the summands with $l > k$. After applying (4.9) in the first and second sums, $\mu(f) = (-1)^k$ in the first sum and renaming the

summation indexes in the second and third summands we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{e|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{l=k}^{L(d/h)}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(-1)^i\binom{l}{i}\sum_{\substack{f|\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\\ L(f)=l}}\mu(f)\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]}\\
&= -\sum_{e|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{\substack{f|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)\\ L(f)=k,\gcd(f,e)=1}}\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]}\\
&\quad-\sum_{E|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(E)(-1)^k\sum_{\substack{F|\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\\ L(F)=k\\ \gcd(E,F)\neq 1 \text{ or } F\nmid\frac{d}{h}}}\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}\\
&\quad+\sum_{E|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(E)\sum_{l=k+1}^{L(d/h)}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(-1)^i\binom{l}{i}\sum_{\substack{F|\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)'\\ L(F)=l}}\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

We now rewrite the first sum in the last expression. Let e and f be as in that sum and set

$$\Delta(e,f)=\Delta_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*],\frac{d/l(f)}{(d/l(f))'}}\quad\text{and}\quad e_0(f)=\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'',\frac{d}{l(f)}\right).$$

Then $\ell([x(e)\uparrow f^*])=l(f)$, by Lemma 3.3.(4). Moreover, $l(f)$ is a proper divisor of d because $L(f)=k<L(d/h)$. So we can apply Lemma 4.2 and, using Lemma 3.3.(4) as well, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]} &= \Delta(e,f)-\sum_{\substack{g|\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'\\ g\neq 1}}\mu(g)\varepsilon_{\left[[x(e)\uparrow f^*]\uparrow\left(\operatorname{lcm}\left(g,\frac{d}{l(f)}\right)\right)_g\right]}=\Delta(e,f)-\sum_{\substack{g|\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'\\ g\neq 1}}\mu(g)\varepsilon_{[[x(e)\uparrow f^*]\uparrow g^{**}]}\\
&= \Delta(e,f)-\sum_{\substack{g|\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'\\ g\neq 1}}\mu(g)\varepsilon_{[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g))\uparrow\operatorname{lcm}(f,g)^*]}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.14}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.3.(5), $\Delta(e,f)=0$ unless $e=e_0(f)$ and $\gcd\left(f,\widehat{d}\right)=1$, and in the latter case we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(e_0(f))\Delta(e_0(f),f)&=\mu(e_0(f))\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)''\right)\delta=\mu(f)\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta\\
&=(-1)^k\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.15}$$

The second equality follows easily considering each prime separately and the third one follows observing that $\mu(f)=(-1)^k$, as $L(f)=k$. Moreover,

$$\left\{f\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right):\gcd\left(f,\widehat{d}\right)=1,L(f)=k\right\}=\left\{f\mid\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)':\gcd\left(f,\widehat{d}\right)=1,L(f)=k\right\}$$

and the cardinality of this set is $\binom{L(n/d)}{k}$. Thus using (4.15) we get

$$\sum_{\substack{f|(d/h)'\\ L(f)=k\\ \gcd(f,\widehat{d})=1}}\mu(e_0(f))\Delta(e_0(f),f)=\mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta(-1)^k\binom{L(n/d)}{k}.$$

Hence, by (4.14) we obtain

$$\sum_{e|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{\substack{f|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)\\ L(f)=k\\ \gcd(f,e)=1}}\varepsilon_{[x(e)\uparrow f^*]} = \mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta(-1)^k\binom{L(n/d)}{k}$$
$$-\sum_{e|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)}\mu(e)\sum_{\substack{f|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right)\\ L(f)=k\\ \gcd(f,e)=1}}\sum_{g|\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'\\ g\neq 1}\mu(g)\varepsilon_{[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g))\uparrow\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*]},$$

which is the desired rewriting.

Inserting this in (4.13) we obtain a new expression of the last summand in (4.12). Plugging this in (4.12) we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{e|\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e)} &= \mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta\sum_{i=0}^{k}(-1)^i\binom{L(n/d)}{i}\\ &-\sum_{(e,f,g)\in A}\mu(e)\mu(g)\varepsilon_{[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g))\uparrow\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*]}+\sum_{(E,F)\in B_k}\mu(E)(-1)^k\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}\\ &-\sum_{l=k+1}^{L(d/h)}\sum_{(E,F)\in B_l}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(-1)^i\binom{l}{i}\mu(E)\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

where

$$A=\left\{(e,f,g):e\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right),f\mid\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right),L(f)=k,\gcd(f,e)=1\neq g,g\mid\left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'\right\}$$

and, for $l=k,k+1,\ldots,L(d/h)$,

$$B_l=\left\{(E,F):E|\gcd\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)',\frac{d}{h}\right),F\mid\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)',L(F)=l\text{ and if }l=k\text{ then }\gcd(E,F)\neq 1\text{ or }F\nmid\frac{d}{h}\right\}.$$

For each $(e,f,g)\in A$ let

$$\Phi(e,f,g)=(e\cdot\gcd(f,g),\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)).$$

By Lemma 3.3.(3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}[x(E)\uparrow F^*]=[x(e\cdot\gcd(f,g))\uparrow\mathrm{lcm}(f,g)^*] &\Leftrightarrow (E,F)=\Phi(e,f,g)\\ &\Leftrightarrow f\mid\gcd\left(F,\frac{d}{h}\right),\ g=\frac{F\cdot\gcd(E,f)}{\gcd(F,f)},\ e=\frac{E}{\gcd(E,f)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

We claim that Φ maps A into $\cup_{l=k}^{L\left(\frac{d}{h}\right)}B_l$. Indeed, suppose that $(e,f,g)\in A$ and let $(E,F)=\Phi(e,f,g)$. Then E is squarefree, since e and f are coprime, and $E\mid\frac{d}{h}$, since both e and f divide $\frac{d}{h}$. Moreover $E\mid\frac{n}{d}$, since $e\mid\frac{n}{d}$ and if p is a prime not dividing $\frac{n}{d}$, but dividing f, then $p\nmid\frac{n}{l(f)}$, so $p\nmid g$ and $p\nmid\gcd(f,g)$. Furthermore F is a squarefree divisor of $\frac{n}{h}$, since so are f and g, and $L(F)\geq k$, since $f\mid F$ and $L(f)=k$. Moreover, if $L(F)=k$, then $\gcd\left(g,\frac{d}{h}\right)$ divides $\gcd\left(F,\frac{d}{h}\right)=\gcd\left(f,\frac{d}{h}\right)$. As $g\neq 1$, either $\gcd(f,g)\neq 1$ or $g\nmid\frac{d}{h}$. In the first case $\gcd(E,F)\neq 1$ and in the second case $F\nmid\frac{d}{h}$.

Furthermore, if (e,f,g) and (E,F) are as in the previous paragraph then

$$\mu(e)\mu(g)=\mu\left(\frac{E}{\gcd(E,f)}\right)\mu\left(\frac{F}{\gcd(F,f)}\cdot\gcd(E,f)\right)=\mu(E)\mu(F)\mu(\gcd(F,f))=(-1)^k\mu(E)\mu(F).$$

We now prove that $|\Phi^{-1}((E,F))|=\binom{l}{k}$ for each $(E,F)\in B_l$. Indeed, if $(E,F)\in B_l$ then there are $\binom{l}{k}$ divisors f of $\gcd\left(F,\frac{d}{h}\right)$ with $L(f)=k$. We claim that for each of these f there is a unique element of the

form (e,f,g) in $\Phi^{-1}(E,F)$. The uniqueness is clear because this condition implies $g=\frac{F}{\gcd(F,f)}\cdot\gcd(E,f)$ and $e=\frac{E}{\gcd(E,f)}$. So it is enough to show that such (e,f,g) belongs to A. Indeed, clearly e and f are coprime and e divides $\gcd\left(\frac{d}{h},\frac{n}{d}\right)$, since so does E. We now prove that $g \mid \left(\frac{n}{l(f)}\right)'$. Otherwise, as clearly g is squarefree, there is a prime p dividing g but not dividing $\frac{n}{l(f)}$. The latter implies $p\nmid\gcd(E,f)$, since if $p\mid f$ then $p\nmid\frac{n}{d}$, implying $p\nmid E$. Thus $p\mid\frac{F}{\gcd(F,f)}$ and hence $p\nmid f$. Therefore, $h_p=l(f)_p=n_p$. So $p\nmid\frac{n}{h}$ contradicting $F\mid\frac{n}{h}$. Finally, $g\neq 1$ because if $L(F)>k$ or $F\nmid\frac{d}{h}$, then $\frac{F}{\gcd(F,f)}\neq 1$, and otherwise, $f=F$ and $\gcd(E,F)\neq 1$, so $\gcd(E,f)\neq 1$. This finishes the proof of the claim.

Assembling this information and using (4.17), we can rewrite (4.16) as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{x(e)} &= \mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta\sum_{i=0}^{k}(-1)^i\binom{L(n/d)}{i}\\ &\quad-\sum_{l=k}^{L(d/h)}\sum_{(E,F)\in B_l}\mu(E)(-1)^k\binom{l}{k}\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}+\sum_{(E,F)\in B_k}\mu(E)(-1)^k\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}\\ &\quad-\sum_{l=k+1}^{L(d/h)}\sum_{(E,F)\in B_l}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(-1)^i\binom{l}{i}\mu(E)\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}\\ &= \mu(e_0)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{h}\right)''\right)\delta\sum_{i=0}^{k}(-1)^i\binom{L(n/d)}{i}-\sum_{l=k+1}^{L(d/h)}\sum_{(E,F)\in B_l}\sum_{i=0}^{k}(-1)^i\binom{l}{i}\mu(E)\mu(F)\varepsilon_{[x(E)\uparrow F^*]}.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (4.12) and of the lemma. □

We now prove that for n odd and greater than 1, $B=\{\alpha_b : b\in\Gamma_{n,1}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$ and, in particular, a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$. Observe that the assumption $n>1$ is necessary because for $n=1$, $B=\{\alpha_1\}=\{2\}$ which is not a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]=\mathbb{Z}$. Other complications occurs when n is even. We also obtain expressions for the coefficients of α_i and λ_i in this basis.

Lemma 4.4. *Let n be an odd integer greater than 1. Then the following statements hold:*

(1) *$B=\{\alpha_b : b\in\Gamma_{n,1}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$.*

(2) *If $b\in\Gamma_{n,1}$ then*

$$C_b(1)=\begin{cases}\mu(n'), & \text{if } \frac{n}{n'}\mid b;\\ 0, & \text{otherwise;}\end{cases}$$

and for every non-negative integer i we have

$$C_b(\alpha_i)=\kappa_i\mu(\ell(i)')\delta_{b,i}^{\frac{n}{\ell(i)'}}\quad\text{and}\quad C_b(\lambda_i)=\sum_{e\mid n'}\mu(e)\sum_{\substack{x\in\Gamma_n\\ \ell(ix)'=e\\ ix\sim_{\frac{n}{e}}b}}\kappa_{ix}\varepsilon_x.$$

(3) *Let $i\in\Gamma_n$ and let $d=\gcd(i,n)$. If $C_b(\lambda_i)\neq 0$ or $C_b(\alpha_i)\neq 0$ for some $b\in\Gamma_{n,1}$ then $\frac{d}{\widetilde{d}'}\mid b$.*

Proof. (1) For every $p\mid n$ fix a primitive n_p-th root of unity ζ_{n_p} such that $\zeta=\prod_{p\mid n}\zeta_{n_p}$. Let $x\in\mathbb{Z}$. For every $p\mid\ell(x)$ we choose an integer $1\leq i_p\leq p-1$ and take $b\in\mathbb{Z}$ with $b\equiv x+i_p\frac{n_p}{p} \mod n_p$ for every $p\mid\ell(x)$ and $b\equiv x \mod n_p$ for $p\nmid\ell(x)$. Then b represents an element $\overline{b}$ of $\Gamma_{n,1}$. The b's obtained in this way form a set of representatives of integers modulo n with $\overline{b}\in\Gamma_{n,1}$ and $x\equiv b \bmod \frac{n}{\ell(x)'}$. On the other hand, from

$$0=\zeta_{n_p}^{x}\left(1+\zeta_{n_p}^{\frac{n_p}{p}}+\zeta_{n_p}^{\frac{2n_p}{p}}+\ldots+\zeta_{n_p}^{\frac{(p-1)n_p}{p}}\right)$$

we obtain

$$\zeta_{n_p}^x = -\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \zeta_{n_p}^{x+\frac{in_p}{p}}. \tag{4.18}$$

Therefore,

$$\zeta^x = \prod_{\substack{p|n\\ p\nmid \ell(x)}} \zeta_{n_p}^x \prod_{\substack{p|n\\ p|\ell(x)}} \left(- \sum_{1\le i_p\le p-1} \zeta_{n_p}^{x+i_p\frac{n_p}{p}} \right) = \mu(\ell(x)') \sum_{\substack{b\equiv x \bmod \frac{n}{\ell(x)'}\\ \overline{b}\in\Gamma_{n,1}}} \zeta^b.$$

Thus

$$\alpha_x = \zeta^x + \zeta^{-x} = \mu(\ell(x)') \left(\sum_{\substack{b\equiv x \bmod \frac{n}{\ell(x)'}\\ \overline{b}\in\Gamma_{n,1}}} \zeta^b + \sum_{\substack{b\equiv -x \bmod \frac{n}{\ell(x)'}\\ \overline{b}\in\Gamma_{n,1}}} \zeta^b \right) = \kappa_x \mu(\ell(x)') \sum_{\substack{b\in\Gamma_{n,1}\\ b\sim_{\frac{n}{\ell(x)'}} x}} \alpha_b. \tag{4.19}$$

We have $[\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1):\mathbb{Q}] = \frac{\varphi(n)}{2}$, where φ denotes the Euler totient function. The projection of $x\in\mathbb{Z}$ in Γ_n belongs to $\Gamma_{n,1}$ if

$$\frac{n_p}{p} - 1 < 2|x:n_p| \le n_p - 1$$

for every prime p dividing n. Thus modulo n_p there are $n_p - \frac{n_p}{p} = \varphi(n_p)$ possibilities for x to projects into $\Gamma_{n,1}$. Multiplying all primes we obtain $\varphi(n)$ classes modulo n projecting into $\Gamma_{n,1}$. Each of these classes contains two elements, because 0 does not project to $\Gamma_{n,1}$. Therefore $|B| \le |\Gamma_{n,1}| = \frac{\varphi(n)}{2} = [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1):\mathbb{Q}]$. On the other hand, by (4.19), B spans $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ and hence B is a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$. Moreover, using that n is odd and greater than 1, one can easily prove that $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$ is the additive subgroup generated by $\{\alpha_x : x\in\Gamma_n\}$. From (4.19) we deduce that B is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$.

(2) By (4.19), $C_b(\alpha_x) = \kappa_x\mu(\ell(x)')\delta_{x,b}^{\frac{n}{\ell(x)'}}$. As the map $a\mapsto C_b(a)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-linear, we deduce that if $i>0$ then

$$C_b(\lambda_i) = \sum_{x\in\Gamma_n} \varepsilon_x C_b(\alpha_{ix}) = \sum_{x\in\Gamma_n} \varepsilon_x\kappa_{ix}\mu(\ell(ix)')\delta_{ix,b}^{\frac{n}{\ell(ix)'}} = \sum_{e|n'} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{x\in\Gamma_n\\ \ell(ix)'=e\\ ix\sim_{\frac{n}{e}} b}} \kappa_{ix}\varepsilon_x.$$

Moreover, $\alpha_0 = 2$ and $\ell(0) = n$. Thus

$$C_b(1) = \mu(n')\delta_{0,b}^{n/n'} = \begin{cases} \mu(n'), & \text{if } \frac{n}{n'} \mid b;\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

(3) If $C_b(\lambda_i)\neq 0$ then there is $x\in\Gamma_n$ such that $ix\sim_{\frac{n}{(\ell(ix))'}} b$. This is also true if $C_b(\alpha_i)\neq 0$, for $x=1$. If $p\mid \widehat{d}$ or $p\nmid \ell(ix)$ then $\left(\frac{d}{\widehat{d}'}\right)_p \mid b$. Suppose that $p\nmid\widehat{d}$ and $p\mid\ell(ix)$. Then from $d_p \mid \frac{n_p}{p}$ and $d_p\mid i$ we have $d_p\mid b$. This shows $\frac{d}{(\widehat{d})'}\mid b$. □

Recall that for any divisor d of n we denote by $\sigma(d)$ a positive integer such that

$$\sigma(d)_p \equiv d_p \bmod n_p \quad \text{for every prime } p \text{ dividing } n.$$

For $x\in\Gamma_{n,d}$ fix $b(x)\in\Gamma_{n,1}$ such that

$$b(x) \equiv \begin{cases} d_p x \mod n_p, & \text{if } p\nmid\widehat{d};\\ \frac{n_p}{p} \mod n_p, & \text{if } p\mid\widehat{d}.\end{cases}$$

Moreover, for every $e \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'$ let

$$N(e) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} : \ell(\sigma(d)y)' = e\widehat{d}' \text{ and } \sigma(d)y \equiv b(x) \bmod \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'} \right\}$$

and let $\overline{N(e)}$ denote the natural image of $N(e)$ in Γ_n.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $x \in \Gamma_n \setminus \{0\}$ with $\ell(x) = d$. Then*

(1) $C_{b(x)}(\alpha_{\sigma(d)}) = \mu\left(\widehat{d}'\right)\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)''\right)\widetilde{\delta_{1,x}^{n/d}}$.

(2) *If $e \mid \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'$ then*

$$\sum_{\substack{y \in \Gamma_n \\ \ell(\sigma(d)y)' = e\widehat{d}' \\ \sigma(d)y \sim_{\frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'}} b(x)}} \kappa_{\sigma(d)y}\varepsilon_y = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \varepsilon_{x(e,z)}.$$

Proof. Let $b = b(x)$.

(1) By Lemma 4.4.(2), we have $C_b(\alpha_{\sigma(d)}) = \mu\left(\ell(\sigma(d))'\right)\delta_{\sigma(d),b}^{n/\ell(\sigma(d))'}$. Thus, it is enough to show that $\ell(\sigma(d))' = \widehat{d}'(n/d)''$ and $\delta_{\sigma(d),b}^{n/\ell(\sigma(d))'} = \widetilde{\delta_{1,x}^{n/d}}$.

Let p be a prime dividing n. If $p \mid \widehat{d}$ then $(\sigma(d) : n_p) = 0$ and otherwise $d_p - 1 < 2\,(\sigma(d) : n_p) = 2d_p \le pd_p - 1$. This proves $\ell(\sigma(d)) = \frac{n/d}{(n/d)'}\widehat{d}$. Thus $\ell(\sigma(d))' = \widehat{d}'(n/d)''$ and hence

$$\frac{n}{\ell(\sigma(d))'} = \frac{n}{\widehat{d}'(n/d)''} = \frac{d}{\widehat{d}'}\widetilde{n/d}.$$

For every $p \mid \widehat{d}$ we have $b \equiv \frac{n_p}{p} \equiv 0 \mod \frac{n_p}{p}$. This implies $\delta_{\sigma(d),b}^{n/\ell(\sigma(d))'} = \delta_{\sigma(d),b}^{n/(\widehat{d}(n/d)'')}$. If $p \mid \frac{n}{\widehat{d}(n/d)''}$ then $p \nmid \widehat{d}$ and, in this case, $\sigma(d) \equiv d_p \bmod n_p$ and $b \equiv d_p x \bmod n_p$. Therefore $\delta_{\sigma(d),b}^{n/\ell(\sigma(d))'} = 1$ if and only if $\delta_{\sigma(d),b}^{n/(\widehat{d}(n/d)'')} = 1$ if and only if there exists $\epsilon = \pm 1$ such that for every $p \mid \frac{n}{d}$ we have $d_p x \equiv d_p \epsilon \mod \left(\frac{n}{(n/d)''}\right)_p$. As the latter holds if and only if $x \equiv \epsilon \bmod \left(\widetilde{n/d}\right)_p$ and this holds for every p if and only if $\delta_{1,x}^{n/d} = 1$, we deduce $\delta_{\sigma(d),b}^{n/\ell(\sigma(d))'} = \widetilde{\delta_{1,x}^{n/d}}$, as desired.

(2) We first prove that

$$N(e) = \{x(e,z) : z \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}\} \quad \text{and} \quad |N(e)| = d. \tag{4.20}$$

For that it is enough to prove that $x(e,z) \in N(e)$ for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ and $|N(e)| \le d$. Clearly, if $p \mid \widehat{d}$ then $p \mid \ell(\sigma(d)x(e,z))$ and $\sigma(d)x(e,z) \equiv 0 \equiv b \mod \frac{n_p}{p}$. Suppose that $p \nmid \widehat{d}$. Then

$$(\sigma(d)x(e,z) : n_p) \equiv d_p\,([x \uparrow e] : n_p) \equiv d_p \left(x : \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p}\right) \bmod n_p$$

and, by Lemma 3.1.(2), $2\,|[x \uparrow e] : n_p| \le \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p} - 1$. Therefore, $(\sigma(d)x(e,z) : n_p) \equiv d_p x \equiv b \mod \frac{n_p}{e_p}$ and $2\,|\sigma(d)x(e,z) : n_p| = 2\,|d_p\,[x \uparrow e] : n_p| \le \frac{n_p}{e_p} - 1$, so that $e_p \mid \ell(\sigma(d)x(e,z))$. Moreover, if $e_p = 1$ then $\frac{n_p}{p} - 1 < 2\,|d_p\,[x \uparrow e] : n_p|$ and hence $p \nmid \ell(\sigma(d)x(e,z))$. This proves $(\ell(\sigma(d)x(e,z)))' = e\widehat{d}'$ and $\sigma(d)x(e,z) \equiv b \mod \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'}$. Hence $x(e,z) \in N(e)$.

Let $M(e) = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} : \sigma(d)y \equiv b \bmod \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'}\}$. As

$$\left|\left\{ y \in \mathbb{Z}/\frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'}\mathbb{Z} : \sigma(d)y \equiv b \bmod \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'} \right\}\right| = \gcd\left(\sigma(d), \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'}\right),$$

we have $|M(e)| = e\widehat{d}' \cdot \gcd\left(\sigma(d), \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'}\right) = de$. However, for each $y_0 \in M(e)$, the set $\{y_0 + i\frac{n}{e} : i = 0, 1, \ldots, e-1\}$ contains e different elements of $M(e)$, but only one of them satisfies $e \mid \ell(\sigma(d)y)$, by Lemma 3.1.(4). This proves $|N(e)| \leq d$ and finishes the proof of (4.20).

Claim: The following statements are equivalent: (a) $0 \in N(e)$; (b) $[x \uparrow e] = 0$; (c) $\left|\overline{N(e)}\right| \neq d$; (d) $\left|\overline{N(e)}\right| = \frac{d+1}{2}$; (e) $\sigma(d)y \equiv 0 \mod n$ for every $y \in N(e)$; (f) $\sigma(d)y \equiv 0 \mod n$ for some $y \in N(e)$.

Indeed, (d) implies (c), (e) implies (f) and (b) implies (e) are obvious using (4.20). Moreover, (b) implies (a) is a consequence of (4.20) and $x(e,0) = [x \uparrow e]$.

By Lemma 3.3.(1), if $z \neq 0$ then $\ell(x(e,z)) = \ell_d(z)$, which is a proper divisor of d. However, $\ell([x \uparrow e])$ is a multiple of d. This implies that if $z \neq 0$ then $x(e,z) \neq 0$ and $x(e,z) \not\sim_n [x \uparrow e]$. In particular, $x(e,z) \not\equiv -[x \uparrow e] \mod n$.

Suppose that $[x \uparrow e] \neq 0$. Then $0 \notin N(e)$, by the previous paragraph. This proves (a) implies (b). To prove (c) implies (b) it is enough to show that if $x(e,z) \sim_n x(e,z_0)$ then $z \equiv z_0 \mod d$. If $x(e,z) \equiv -x(e,z_0) \mod n$ then $-[x \uparrow e] \equiv x(e, z+z_0) \mod n$ and hence $0 \equiv z + z_0 \mod d$, by the previous paragraph. Therefore, $-[x \uparrow e] \equiv [x \uparrow e] \mod n$ and this implies $[x \uparrow e] = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, if $x(e,z) \sim_n x(e,z_0)$ then $x(e,z) \equiv x(e,z_0) \mod n$ and hence $z \equiv z_0 \mod d$, as desired.

Otherwise, i.e. if $[x \uparrow e] = 0$ then $z \sim_d z_0$ if and only if $x(e,z) \sim_n x(e,z_0)$. Thus, in this case $|\overline{N(e)}| = |\Gamma_d| = \frac{d+1}{2}$. This proves (b) implies (d). Finally, $\sigma(d)y \equiv d_p\,[x \uparrow e] \mod n_p$ for every p every $y \in N(e)$. As $2\,|[x \uparrow e] : n_p| \leq \frac{n_p}{d_p e_p} - 1$, we have $|\sigma(d)y : n_p| = 0$ if and only if $([x \uparrow e] : n_p) = 0$. Therefore, if $[x \uparrow e] \neq 0$ then $\sigma(d)y \not\equiv 0 \mod n$ for every $y \in N(e)$. This proves (f) implies (b) and finishes the proof of the Claim.

By (4.20) and the Claim, if $[x \uparrow e] \neq 0$ then $\kappa_{\sigma(d)y} = 1$ for every $y \in N(e)$ and

$$\sum_{\substack{y \in \Gamma_n \\ \ell(\sigma(d)y)' = e\widehat{d}' \\ \sigma(d)y \sim \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'} b}} \kappa_{\sigma(d)y}\varepsilon_y = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \varepsilon_{x(e,z)}.$$

Otherwise, i.e. in case $[x \uparrow e] = 0$ then $\kappa_{\sigma(d)y} = 2$ for every $y \in N(e)$ and therefore

$$\sum_{\substack{y \in \Gamma_n \\ \ell(\sigma(d)y)' = e\widehat{d}' \\ \sigma(d)y \sim \frac{n}{e\widehat{d}'} b}} \kappa_{\sigma(d)y}\varepsilon_y = 2\sum_{z=0}^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \varepsilon_{x(e,z)}.$$

The latter is equal to $\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \varepsilon_{x(e,z)}$, since $x(e,0) = 0$ and $x(e,z) = x(e,-z)$ for every z. □

The following lemma completes the proof of Lemma 4.1 as explained in the sketch at the beginning of this section.

Lemma 4.6. *Let n be an odd integer greater than 1 and let d be a proper divisor of n such that $\lambda_i = \alpha_i$ for every $1 \leq i < d$. For every $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$ such that $\frac{d}{\widehat{d}'} \mid b$ there is $x \in \Gamma_{n,d}$ such that*

$$C_b(\lambda_{\sigma(d)}) = C_b(\alpha_{\sigma(d)}) + d\mu\left(\widehat{d}\,'\right)\tau_x.$$

Proof. We first prove that for every divisor c of d and any $x \in \Gamma_{n,c}$ we have

$$C_{b(x)}(\lambda_{\sigma(c)}) = C_{b(x)}(\alpha_{\sigma(c)}) + c\mu\left(\widehat{c}\,'\right)\tau_x. \tag{4.21}$$

We argue by induction on c. So, if a is proper a divisor of c and $y \in \Gamma_{n,a}$ we can assume that $\tau_y = 0$. This allows us to use Lemma 4.3.

Having in mind that $\sum_{\substack{y\in\Gamma_n,\\ \sigma(c)y\sim_{\frac{n}{e}}b(x),\\ \ell(\sigma(c)y)'=e}}\kappa_{\sigma(c)y}\varepsilon_y\neq 0$ implies $\widehat{c}\,'\mid e$, from Lemma 4.4.(2) and Lemma 4.5.(2) we obtain

$$C_{b(x)}(\lambda_{\sigma(c)})=\mu(\widehat{c}\,')\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{c}\right)'}\mu(e)\sum_{\substack{y\in\Gamma_n\\ \ell(\sigma(c)y)'=e\widehat{c}\,'\\ \sigma(c)y\sim_{\frac{n}{e\widehat{c}\,'}}b(x)}}\kappa_{\sigma(c)y}\varepsilon_y=\mu(\widehat{c}\,')\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{c}\right)'}\mu(e)\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}/c\mathbb{Z}}\varepsilon_{x(e,z)}. \tag{4.22}$$

Applying, in this order, Lemma 4.3, Lemma 3.4, Lemma 4.5.(1) and (4.1) to (4.22) we get

$$\begin{aligned}C_{b(x)}(\lambda_{\sigma(c)}) &= \mu(\widehat{c}\,')\left(\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}/c\mathbb{Z}}\left(\beta_{x,z}+\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{c}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]}\right)\right)\\ &= \mu\left(\widehat{c}\,'\right)\left(\mu\left(\left(\frac{n}{c}\right)''\right)\widetilde{\delta_{1,x}^{n/c}}+c\left(\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{c}\right)'}\mu(e)\varepsilon_{[x\uparrow e]}-\Delta_{x,1}\right)\right)\\ &= C_{b(x)}(\alpha_{\sigma(c)})+c\mu\left(\widehat{c}\,'\right)\tau_x.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (4.21).

By (4.21) and the assumption of the lemma for every $y\in\Gamma_n$, with $\ell(y)$ a proper divisor of d we have $\tau_y=0$. Let now $b\in\Gamma_{n,1}$ such that $\frac{d}{\widehat{d}'}$ divides b and let $x\in\Gamma_n$ satisfying

$$x\equiv\begin{cases}\frac{b}{d_p}\bmod n_p, & \text{if } p\nmid\widehat{d};\\ 0\bmod n_p, & \text{if } p\mid\widehat{d};\end{cases}$$

for every $p\mid n$. By straightforward calculations we have $\ell(x)=d$. So we can apply again Lemma 4.3 and, as in (4.22), and arguing as above we first obtain

$$C_b(\lambda_{\sigma(d)})=\mu(\widehat{d}\,')\sum_{e\mid\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)'}\mu(e)\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}}\varepsilon_{x(e,z)},$$

and then we get $C_b(\lambda_{\sigma(d)})=C_b(\alpha_{\sigma(d)})+d\mu\left(\widehat{d}\,'\right)\tau_x$, as desired. □

5. Eigenvalues analysis

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. Recall that $G=\mathrm{PSL}(2,t^f)$ for some prime t and u is a unit of $\mathbb{Z}G$ of order n with $\gcd(n,2t)=1$ such that u^c is rationally conjugate to an element of G for every divisor c of n different from 1. In particular u is a unit of augmentation 1, since it is of odd order. Recall also that we have fixed $g_0\in G$ of order n and a primitive n-th root of unity ζ in characteristic p such that $\Theta_1(u)$, $\Theta_1(g_0)$ and $\mathrm{diag}(1,\zeta,\zeta^{-1})$ are conjugate and that ζ also denotes a complex primitive n-th root of unity used to define Brauer characters. We want to show that u is rationally conjugate to g_0 and we are arguing by contradiction. In particular, n is not a prime power, by Theorem 2.2.(2). Moreover, using Lemma 2.3, we know that $\lambda_d\neq\alpha_d$ for some positive integer d and we are assuming that d is minimal with this property. This implies that d is a proper divisor of n and, by (2.5), $\lambda_d=\alpha_d+d\tau$ for some $\tau\in\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1]$. By (2.6), this implies $\chi_d(u)=\chi_d(g_0)+d\tau$. Furthermore, $\tau\neq 0$, as $\lambda_d\neq\alpha_d$. Therefore

$$C_b(\chi_d(u)-1)\equiv C_b(\chi_d(g_0)-1)\mod d \tag{5.1}$$

for every $b\in\Gamma_{n,1}$ and

$$|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)-C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)|\geq d. \tag{5.2}$$

for some $b_0 \in \Gamma_{n,1}$. We will use this to obtain a contradiction by comparing the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(g_0)$ and $\Theta_d(u)$. Of course we do not know the eigenvalues of the latter but we know the eigenvalues of each $\Theta_d(g_0^i)$ and hence we also know the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(u^c)$ for every divisor c of n different from 1, by the hypothesis on the powers of u. For example, the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(u^{\frac{n}{d}})$ are 1, with multiplicity 3, and all the other d-th roots of unity, with multiplicity 2.

We first estimate the coefficients of $\chi_d(u) - 1$ and $\chi_d(g_0) - 1$ in the basis B. Denote by $P(m)$ the number of prime divisors of a positive integer m.

Lemma 5.1. *Let d be a proper divisor of n. For every $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$ we have $|C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 2^{P(d)+1}$.*

Proof. Since $C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} C_b(\alpha_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mu(\ell(i)')\delta_{b,i}^{n/\ell(i)'}$, by Lemma 4.4.(2), the lemma follows from the following inequality for every $e \mid d'$:

$$\left|\left\{i = 1, \ldots, d : \ell_d(i)' = e, \delta_{b,i}^{n/\ell(i)'} = 1\right\}\right| \leq 2. \tag{5.3}$$

To prove (5.3) let $1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq d$ with $\ell_d(i_j)' = e$ and $\delta_{b,i_j}^{n/\ell(i_j)'} = 1$ for $j = 1, 2$. This implies that there is $\epsilon = \pm 1$ with $i_1 \equiv \epsilon i_2 \bmod \frac{n_p}{p}$ for every prime p dividing n and if $p \nmid e$ then $i_1 \equiv \epsilon i_2 \bmod n_p$. Suppose that $i_1 \not\equiv \epsilon i_2 \bmod d_p$. Then $n_p = d_p$ and $p \mid e$. This implies that $p \mid e = \ell(i_j)'$ for $j = 1$ and $j = 2$, $i_1 \sim_{\frac{n}{p}} i_2$ and $i_1 \not\equiv i_2 \bmod n$. This contradicts Lemma 3.1.(4). Therefore $i_1 \equiv \epsilon i_2 \bmod d$. This proves (5.3). □

Lemma 5.2. *Let u be an element of $V(\mathbb{Z}G)$ of order n coprime with t. Suppose that u^c is rationally conjugate to an element of G for every $c \mid n$ with $c \neq 1$. Let d be a proper divisor of n and $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$. Then the following statements hold:*

1. $|C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq 2 + 3 \cdot 2^{P(\gcd(d,n''))} + 2^{P(\gcd(d,n'/n''))+1} \leq 2 + 3 \cdot 2^{P(d)}$.
2. *If n is squarefree then $|C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq 2^{P(d)+1}$.*
3. *If $n \neq pd$ with p the smallest prime dividing n then $|C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq 3 \cdot 2^{P(d)}$.*

Proof. Denote by m_i the multiplicity of ζ^i as an eigenvalue of $\Theta_d(u)$. The degree of Θ_d is $1 + 2d$ and the set of eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(u)$ is closed under taking inverses. Therefore m_0 is odd, so in particular positive, and $m_i = m_{-i}$. Hence, $1 + 2d = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m_i = m_0 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} m_i$ and $\chi_{(d)}(u) = m_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} m_i\alpha_i$. Thus,

$$C_b(\chi_d(u)) = m_0 C_b(1) + \sum_{i \in \Gamma_n \setminus \{0\}} m_i C_b(\alpha_i)$$

and hence, by Lemma 4.4.(2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1)| &= \left|(m_0 - 1)C_b(1) + \sum_{i \in \Gamma_n \setminus \{0\}} m_i C_b(\alpha_i)\right| = \left|(m_0 - 1)\mu(n')\delta_{b,0}^{n/n'} + \sum_{i \in \Gamma_n \setminus \{0\}} m_i \mu(\ell(i)')\delta_{b,i}^{n/\ell(i)'}\right| \\ &\leq (m_0 - 1) + \sum_{e \mid n'} \sum_{\substack{i \neq 0 \\ \ell(i)' = e \\ b \sim_{\frac{n}{e}} i}} m_i. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1, if $e \mid n'$ then the only element i in Γ_n satisfying $\ell(i)' = e$ and $b \sim_{\frac{n}{e}} i$ is $[b \uparrow e]$. Combining this information with the previous inequality we obtain

$$|C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq (m_0 - 1) + \sum_{\substack{e \mid n' \\ [b \uparrow e] \neq 0}} m_{[b \uparrow e]} \leq (m_0 - 1) + \sum_{e \mid d'} \sum_{f \mid \frac{n'}{d'}} m_{[b \uparrow ef]}. \tag{5.4}$$

If moreover n is squarefree then $[b \uparrow e] = 0$ if and only if $e = n$ by Lemma 3.1. Therefore from the expression in the middle of (5.4) we obtain

$$|C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq -1 + \sum_{e|d'} \sum_{f|\frac{n'}{d'}} m_{[b\uparrow ef]} \quad (\text{if } n = n'). \tag{5.5}$$

We claim that for a fixed $e \mid d'$, we have

$$\sum_{f|\frac{n'}{d'}} m_{[b\uparrow ef]} \leq \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } \gcd(d, n'/n'') \nmid e; \\ 3, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

Let $M = \{[b \uparrow ef] : f \mid \frac{n'}{d'}\}$. By Lemma 3.1 we have

$$M = \left\{ i \in \Gamma_n : \gcd(\ell(i), d') = e, i \equiv b \bmod \frac{n}{e \cdot \gcd\left(\frac{n'}{d'}, \ell(i)\right)} \right\}.$$

For every $i, j \in M$ we prove that $i \equiv j \mod d$. Indeed, let p be a prime dividing d. Then clearly $i \equiv j \mod d_p$, if $n_p \neq d_p$. If $n_p = d_p$ then $p \nmid f$ and if also $p \nmid e$ then $i \equiv j \mod d_p$. If $p \mid e$ and $n_p = d_p$ then $2(i : n_p) \leq \frac{n_p}{p} - 1$, $2(j : n_p) \leq \frac{n_p}{p} - 1$ and $i \equiv j \mod \frac{n_p}{p}$. Hence $i \equiv j \mod d_p$ by Lemma 3.1.(4), as desired.

Fix $i \in M$. By the previous paragraph we get

$$\frac{n}{d} i \equiv \frac{n}{d} j \bmod n \text{ for every } j \in M.$$

Hence $\xi = \zeta^{\frac{n}{d}i}$ is independent of the choice of $i \in M$. If ζ^i is an eigenvalue of $\Theta_d(u)$ then ξ is an eigenvalue of $\Theta_d(u^{\frac{n}{d}})$. Therefore, $\sum_{f|\frac{n'}{d'}} m_{[b\uparrow ef]}$ is at most the multiplicity, say r, of ξ as an eigenvalue of $\Theta_d(u^{\frac{n}{d}})$. As $d \neq n$, applying the hypothesis we have that $\Theta_d(u^{\frac{n}{d}})$ is conjugate to $\Theta_d(g_1)$ for an element $g_1 \in \langle g_0 \rangle$ of order d. Then $\sum_{f|\frac{n'}{d'}} m_{[b\uparrow ef]} \leq r \leq 3$. Moreover, $r = 3$ if and only if $\xi = 1$ if and only if $d \mid i$. Suppose that $\gcd(d, n'/n'') \nmid e$ and let p be a prime dividing $\gcd(d, n'/n'')$ (i.e. $n_p = d_p = p$) but not dividing e. Then $i \equiv b \not\equiv 0 \mod d_p$, and hence $r \leq 2$. Thus (5.6) follows.

Clearly m_0 is at most the multiplicity of 1 as an eigenvalue of $\Theta_d(u^{n/d})$. Thus $m_0 \leq 3$ and if the equality holds then $n = pd$ with p the smallest prime dividing n. Combining this with (5.4), (5.5) and (5.6) we thus get

$$|C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq \begin{cases} -1 + 2(2^{P(d)} - 1) + 3 = 2^{P(d)+1}, & \text{if } n = n'; \\ 3 \cdot 2^{P(d)}, & \text{if } n \neq pd \text{ with } p \text{ the smallest prime dividing } n; \\ 2 + 3 \cdot 2^{P(\gcd(d,n''))} + 2^{P(\gcd(d,n'/n''))+1}, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

as desired. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We claim that $d \in \{3, 5, 7, 15\}$. Combining (5.2) with the inequalities of Lemma 5.2.(1) and Lemma 5.1 we obtain

$$d \leq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 5 \cdot 2^{P(d)} + 2.$$

Hence, if $P(d) \geq 3$ then $d \geq 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 2^{P(d)-3} > 5 \cdot 2^{P(d)+1} + 2 \geq d$, a contradiction, and if $P(d) = 2$ then $d \in \{15, 21\}$. However, if $d = 21$ then $n = 63$ because otherwise, using Lemma 5.2.(3) and Lemma 5.1 we obtain $21 \leq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 20$ and for $n = 63$, using Lemma 5.2.(1) we obtain $21 \leq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 16$, again a contradiction. Thus if $P(d) \neq 1$ then $d = 15$. Finally, suppose that $P(d) = 1$, i.e. d is prime. Then, as n is not a prime power, either n is squarefree or $n \neq pd$ with p the smallest prime dividing n. Then, by the inequalities in statements (2) and (3) of Lemma 5.2, we have

$$d \leq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 10,$$

and hence $d \in \{3,5,7\}$. This finishes the proof of the claim.

In order to deal with the four possible values for d we first obtain expressions for $C_b(\chi_d(u)-1)$ and $C_b(\chi_d(g_0)-1)$. Let $\nu_1,\dots,\nu_d \in \Gamma_n$ (with repetitions if needed) such that the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(u)$ with multiplicities are $1, \zeta^{\pm\nu_1},\dots,\zeta^{\pm\nu_d}$. Therefore $C_b(\chi_d(u)-1)$ is the coefficient of α_b in the expression of $\alpha_{\nu_1}+\cdots+\alpha_{\nu_d}$ in the basis $\Gamma_{n,1}$. By Lemma 4.4.(2) we obtain

$$C_b(\chi_d(u)-1) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mu(\ell(\nu_i)')\delta_{b,\nu_i}^{n/\ell(\nu_i)'}. \tag{5.7}$$

As the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(g_0)$ are $1, g_0^{\pm 1}, g_0^{\pm 2},\dots,g_0^{\pm d}$ we also obtain

$$C_b(\chi_d(g_0)-1) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mu(\ell(i)')\delta_{b,i}^{n/\ell(i)'}. \tag{5.8}$$

If c is a divisor of n different from 1 then the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(u^c)$ with multiplicities are $1, \zeta^{\pm c\nu_1},\dots,\zeta^{c\nu_d}$ and they coincide with the eigenvalues of $\Theta_d(g_0^c)$, which are precisely $1,\zeta^{\pm c},\dots,\zeta^{\pm cd}$. Therefore the lists of images of $\nu_1 c, \nu_2 c,\dots,\nu_d c$ and $c, 2c,\dots,dc$ in Γ_n coincide after a permutation and hence the lists of images of $\nu_1,\dots,\nu_d$ and $1,2,\dots,d$ in $\Gamma_{n/c}$ also coincide. We express this by writing $(\nu_1,\nu_2,\dots,\nu_d) \sim_{n/c} (1,2,\dots,d)$.

Assume first that d is prime. Since $(1,...,d) \sim_d (\nu_1,...,\nu_d)$, exactly one of the ν_i is divisible by d, say ν_d. In particular, for $i \neq d$ we have $n_d \nmid \ell(\nu_i)$ and so $d \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$. Also $d \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ for $i \neq d$. Moreover if j is an integer non multiple of d then $|\{1 \leq i \leq d-1 : \nu_i \sim_d j\}| = 2$. This implies that

$$\left|\left\{1 \leq i \leq d-1 : \delta_{b,i}^{n/\ell(i)'} = 1\right\}\right| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \left|\left\{1 \leq i \leq d-1 : \delta_{b,\nu_i}^{n/\ell(\nu_i)'} = 1\right\}\right| \leq 2. \tag{5.9}$$

So from (5.2), (5.7), (5.8) and (5.9) we obtain

$$d \leq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \leq 6.$$

Hence $d \in \{3,5\}$.

We claim that $n' = 15$. By means of contradiction suppose that n is divisible by a prime p greater than 5. If $i = 1,\dots,d$ then $p \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$, for otherwise $n_p = (\ell(i)')_p = p$ and so $p \mid i \leq d < p$, a contradiction. As moreover, $(\nu_1,\dots,\nu_d) \sim_p (1,\dots,d)$ we deduce that also $p \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Moreover, at most two $\nu_1,...,\nu_d$ are equal in Γ_p and this is also the case for $1,...,d$. So in this case $d \leq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \leq 4$. This proves the claim for $d = 5$. Suppose that $d = 3$. Then $d \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$. This implies that all the $1,...,d$ are different in Γ_p and so even $d \leq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \leq 2$, a contradiction. This finishes the proof of the claim.

Suppose $d = 5$. By (5.7), (5.8) and (5.9) we obtain $|C_b(\chi_d(u)-1)|, |C_b(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \leq 3$ and by (5.2)

$$|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)| + |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \geq |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1) - C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \geq 5.$$

Therefore by (5.1) we have $\{|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)|, |C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)|\} = \{2,3\}$ and either $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)$ or $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)$ is positive and the other is negative. If $25 \mid n$, then $5 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ and $5 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ for all $i = 1,\dots,d$, so again $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)| \leq 2$ and $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \leq 2$, a contradiction. Thus $n_5 = 5$. Assume next that $3^3 \mid n$. Then $9 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ and $9 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ for every i and since only two of the numbers $1,...,5$ are equal in Γ_9 and also $(1,...,5) \sim_9 (\nu_1,...,\nu_5)$ once more $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)| \leq 2$ and $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \leq 2$, again a contradiction. We conclude that $n \in \{15,45\}$.

Suppose that $n = 45$. Then

$$\ell(1) = 3,\ \ell(2) = \ell(3) = \ell(4) = 1 \ \text{ and } \ \ell(5) = 5.$$

So, for every $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$ we have

$$C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = -\delta^{15}_{b,1} + \delta^{45}_{b,2} + \delta^{45}_{b,3} + \delta^{45}_{b,4} - \delta^{9}_{b,5}.$$

In this expression there is at most one positive summand since $2, 3$ and 4 are pairwise different in Γ_{45}. By the above, this implies $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1) = -2$ and $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1) = 3$. For the levels of the ν_i there are the following possibilities: Either three of the ν_i have level 1 and two have prime level (if $\nu_5 \nsim_9 1$) or four have level 1 and one has level 15 (if $\nu_5 \sim_9 1$). If e.g. ν_1 and ν_2 have level 1, then not both δ^{45}_{b,ν_1} and δ^{45}_{b,ν_2} can be 1 since from $(1, ..., 5) \sim_{15} (\nu_1, ..., \nu_5)$ we know that ν_1 and ν_2 are different in Γ_{45}. So at most one of the elements of level 1 can contribute positively to $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)$ in (5.7). If the level of some ν_i is a prime, then $\mu(\ell(\nu_i)')$ is negative. So in any case $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1) \leq 2$, a contradiction.

Hence we know that $n = 15$. In this case $\ell(1) = \ell(2) = \ell(4) = 1$, $\ell(3) = 3$ and $\ell(5) = 5$. Then exactly three or four $i = 1, \ldots, 5$ satisfy $\ell(\nu_i) = 1$, since $(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_5) \sim_3 (1, \ldots, 5)$. Moreover, for every $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$ we have

$$C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = \delta^{15}_{b,1} + \delta^{15}_{b,2} - \delta^{5}_{b,3} + \delta^{15}_{b,4} - \delta^{3}_{b,5}.$$

If $\delta^{15}_{b,i} = 1$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, then also $\delta^{3}_{b,5} = 1$ and $\delta^{15}_{b,j} = 0$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, 4\}$. So $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) \leq 1$, implying $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = -2$ and hence $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1) = 3$. If exactly three ν_i have level 1, then the level of the other two elements is a prime, i.e. they can not give a positive summand in the expression of $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)$ in (5.7), since their sign is negative. Also not all of the three positive summands of $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)$ can contribute a positive summand since some of the corresponding ν_i are not equal in Γ_5. This yields a contradiction with $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1) = 3$. So exactly four of the ν_i have level 1, while ν_5 has level 15, and hence

$$C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1) = \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_1} + \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_2} + \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_3} + \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_4} + \delta^{1}_{b,\nu_5},$$

for every $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$. Applying the above formulas for $b = 1$ we have

$$1 \leq C_1(\chi(u) - 1) - C_1(\chi(g_0) - 1) = 1 + \delta^{15}_{1,\nu_1} + \delta^{15}_{1,\nu_2} + \delta^{15}_{1,\nu_3} + \delta^{15}_{1,\nu_4} \leq 3$$

since $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_4) \sim_5 (1, 2, 3, 4)$. This yields a contradiction with (5.1).

Assume that $d = 3$. Then $n_3 = 3$ for otherwise 15 divides $\frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ and $\frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ for every $i = 1, 2, 3$ and hence $|C_{b_0}(\chi(u) - 1)|$ and $|C_{b_0}(\chi(u) - 1)|$ are both at most 1, in contradiction with (5.2). If $5^3 \mid n$, then $25 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ and $25 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ for all i, so $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 1$ and $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq 1$, again a contradiction. Next assume that $n_5 = 25$. Then $\ell(1) = \ell(2) = 5$ and $\ell(3) = 3$, so

$$C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = -\delta^{15}_{b,1} - \delta^{15}_{b,2} - \delta^{25}_{b,3},$$

for each $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$. Suppose $\nu_3 \sim_{25} 3$. Then $\ell(\nu_1) = \ell(\nu_2) = 5$ and $\ell(\nu_3) = 3$, so

$$C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1) = -\delta^{15}_{b,\nu_1} - \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_2} - \delta^{25}_{b,\nu_3}$$

for every $b \in \Gamma_{n,1}$. Moreover $\delta^{25}_{b,\nu_3} = \delta^{25}_{b,3}$, so $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1) - C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 2$, a contradiction. Thus $\nu_3 \not\sim_{25} 3$ and we may assume without loss of generality that $\nu_1 \sim_{25} 3$. If $\nu_3 \sim_{25} 2$ then $\ell(\nu_1) = 1$, $\ell(\nu_2) = 5$ and $\ell(\nu_3) = 15$, so

$$C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1) = \delta^{75}_{b,\nu_1} - \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_2} + \delta^{5}_{b,\nu_3}.$$

Setting $b = 13$ we obtain $C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1) - C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = 2$, contradicting (5.1). So $\nu_3 \sim_{25} 1$ and arguing as above with $b = 14$ we obtain $C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1) - C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) \in \{1, 2\}$, again a contradiction.

The last remaining case for $d = 3$ is $n = 15$. Then

$$C_b(\chi_d(u) - 1) - C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_1} + \delta^{15}_{b,\nu_2} - \delta^{5}_{b,\nu_3} - \delta^{15}_{b,1} - \delta^{15}_{b,2} + \delta^{5}_{b,3}.$$

Since $1 \nsim_{15} 2$, we must have $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1) - C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = 3$ and $\nu_3 \sim_5 1$ while $\nu_1 \sim_5 \nu_2 \sim_5 2$. Then $C_1(\chi_d(u) - 1) - C_1(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = -2$, a contradiction again.

Finally let $d = 15$. Let p be a prime dividing n such that $p \geq 7$. Then $(1, ..., 15) \sim_p (\nu_1, ..., \nu_{15})$. Thus $p \mid i$ for at most two $i = 1, \ldots, 15$ and at most five of the remaining are equal in Γ_p. The same holds for the ν_i. If $p \nmid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ then $n_p = p$ and hence $p \mid i$. Thus, if $p \nmid i$ then $p \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ and similarly, if $p \nmid \nu_i$ then $p \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$. Therefore $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 7$ and $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq 7$, in contradiction with (5.2). Thus, since n is not a prime power, $n' = 15$. Assume that $25 \mid n$. Then $5 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ and $5 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 15$. Since the maximal number of elements in $1, ..., 15$ being equal in Γ_5 is six, this implies $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1)| \leq 6$ and $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u) - 1)| \leq 6$, again a contradiction. If $27 \mid n$, then $9 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ and $9 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(i)'}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 15$. Since the maximal number of elements of $1, ..., 15$ being equal in Γ_9 is three, again we obtain a contradiction.

Since $d < n$ by assumption, the last remaining case for $d = 15$ is $n = 45$. Since $(1, ..., 15) \sim_5 (\nu_1, ..., \nu_{15})$, exactly three of the numbers $\nu_1, ..., \nu_{15}$ are divisible by 5 and the others are grouped into tuples of six elements being equal in Γ_5. If $5 \nmid \nu_i$ then $5 \mid \frac{n}{\ell(\nu_i)'}$ and hence $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(u)-1)| \leq 9$, so $|C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0)-1)| \geq 6$. Computing the levels of $1, ..., 15$ we get $\ell(1) = \ell(8) = 3$, $\ell(2) = \ell(3) = \ell(4) = \ell(6) = \ell(7) = \ell(11) = \ell(12) = \ell(13) = \ell(14) = 1$, $\ell(5) = \ell(15) = 5$, $\ell(9) = 9$ and $\ell(10) = 15$. So

$$C_b(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) = -\delta_{b,1}^{15} + \delta_{b,2}^{45} + \delta_{b,3}^{45} + \delta_{b,4}^{45} - \delta_{b,5}^{9} + \delta_{b,6}^{45} + \delta_{b,7}^{45} - \delta_{b,8}^{15} - \delta_{b,9}^{15} + \delta_{b,10}^{3} + \delta_{b,11}^{45} + \delta_{b,12}^{45} + \delta_{b,13}^{45} + \delta_{b,14}^{45} - \delta_{b,15}^{9}.$$

Since only five of the summands involved are possibly negative, we know $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) \geq -5$. But since all the numbers $1, ..., 15$ are different in Γ_{45} we obtain also that $C_{b_0}(\chi_d(g_0) - 1) \leq 2$, a contradiction. □

References

[BC15] A. Bächle and M. Caicedo. On the prime graph question for almost simple groups with an alternating socle. 2015. arXiv:math/1510.04598 [math.GR], 11 pages.

[BKL08] V. A. Bovdi, A. B. Konovalov, and S. Linton. Torsion units in integral group ring of the Mathieu simple group M_{22}. *LMS J. Comput. Math.*, 11:28–39, 2008.

[Ble99] F. M. Bleher. Finite groups of Lie type of small rank. *Pacific J. Math.*, 187(2):215–239, 1999.

[BM14] A. Bächle and L. Margolis. Rational conjugacy of torsion units in integral group rings of non-solvable groups. 2014. accepted in Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc., arXiv:1305.7419 [math.RT], 22 pages.

[BM16] A. Bächle and L. Margolis. On the Prime Graph Question for Integral Group Rings of 4-primary groups II. 2016. preprint, arXiv:1601.05689 [math.RT], 17 pages.

[Cala] C. K. Caldwell. Heuristics: Deriving the Wagstaff Mersenne Conjecture. http://primes.utm.edu/mersenne/heuristic.html. Visited August 2016.

[Calb] C. K. Caldwell. Mersenne primes: History, theorems and lists. http://primes.utm.edu/mersenne/. Visited August 2016.

[CMdR13] M. Caicedo, L. Margolis, and Á. del Río. Zassenhaus conjecture for cyclic-by-abelian groups. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 88(1):65–78, 2013.

[dRS16] Á. del Río and M. Serrano. On the torsion units of the integral group ring of finite projective special linear groups. 2016. arXiv:1508.04548v2 [math.RA], 27 pages.

[Her06] M. Hertweck. On the torsion units of some integral group rings. *Algebra Colloq.*, 13(2):329–348, 2006.

[Her07] M. Hertweck. Partial augmentations and Brauer character values of torsion units in group rings. 2007. arXiv:math/0612429 [math.RA], 16 pages.

[Her08] M. Hertweck. Zassenhaus conjecture for A_6. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.*, 118(2):189–195, 2008.

[Hup67] B. Huppert. *Endliche Gruppen. I.* Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 134. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1967.

[JdR16] E. Jespers and Á. del Río. *Group ring groups. Volume 1: Orders and generic constructions of units.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.

[LP89] I. S. Luthar and I. B. S. Passi. Zassenhaus conjecture for A_5. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.*, 99(1):1–5, 1989.

[Mar16] L. Margolis. A Sylow theorem for the integral group ring of $\mathrm{PSL}(2, q)$. *J. Algebra*, 445:295–306, 2016.

[MRSW87] Z. Marciniak, J. Ritter, S. K. Sehgal, and A. Weiss. Torsion units in integral group rings of some metabelian groups II. *J. Number Theory*, 25(3):340–352, 1987.

[Pom81] C. Pomerance. Recent developments in primality testing. *Math. Intelligencer*, 3(3):97–105, 1980/81.

[Sal13] M. Salim. The prime graph conjecture for integral group rings of some alternating groups. *Int. J. Group Theory*, 2(1):175–185, 2013.

[Wag83] S. Wagstaff. Divisors of Mersenne numbers. *Math. Comp.*, 40(161):385–397, 1983.

[Wei91] A. Weiss. Torsion units in integral group rings. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 415:175–187, 1991.

[Zas74] H. J. Zassenhaus. On the torsion units of finite group rings. In *Studies in mathematics (in honor of A. Almeida Costa) (Portuguese)*, pages 119–126. Instituto de Alta Cultura, Lisbon, 1974.